APPENDIX A – COMMENT RESPONSE

This page intentionally left blank

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
June 1, 2004 CDPHE Letter			
1.	The Department is aware that DOE intends to make improvements to the Pond C-l dam and outlet on Woman Creek under a NEPA Categorical Exclusion. However, the Department contends that the Woman Creek drainage and ponds should be eva1uated in this document, and expects that other community members will provide DOE with the same comment. The draft EA does not address Woman Creek at all. We believe that there is value of holistically looking at both drainages that have been modified by Site operations.	1, 16	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Non-Related Surface Water Structures.
2.	The report states in several passages that water depletion issues are outside the scope of this document, yet the document does address this issue in a qualitative way. We contend that water depletion issues should in fact be thoroughly addressed in this document.	2	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Scope of Analysis in Environmental Assessment.
3.	An important part of the proposed and alternative actions are missing. While the basic premise of the proposed and alternative actions are well described, the infrastructure and logistical implications of implementing the actions are not addressed. The report states these considerations are outside the scope of this report. The Department disagrees. Such issues are part and parce1 of the proposal and must be considered.	24	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Detailed Infrastructure and Operations.
4.	The use of modeling to predict future hydraulic conditions in creeks and drainages is appropriate. However, modeling results in estimations and involves a level of uncertainty. The Department desires that the interim and final configurations of the RFETS drainages are robust enough to endure conditions that may be the extreme of modeled future conditions.	11	DOE-RFPO agrees with the comment. Engineering analyses incorporated into the specific design of the system modifications will evaluate extreme flow conditions.

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
5.	The impact to wildlife caused by the different remedial actions, as presented in the Report, appears to be based on supposition rather than on evidence of animal behavior.	4	The impacts are based on 10 years of observations of wildlife and wildlife data collected at the Site. Observations from other project activities at the Site have indicated that the wildlife return to disturbed areas after project completion. Additionally, from a historical perspective, the ponds were not part of the original Site, but installed after DOE acquired the Site. Therefore the wildlife that now exist around the ponds and utilize the resources that are present have come in and made use of the available niches that were created. The same thing should occur after the pond activities are completed.
6.	§1.l.2, Page 3, paragraph 1: The argument that is presented for keeping some of the ponds is that they act to reduce the actinide concentration in waters passing through them. This means they are a treatment system, and part of the remedy. The Department insists that the ponds not be used for treatment. Rather, the Department contends that the ponds serve as an "insurance policy" for the community for a period of time after closure until the remedy above the ponds bas been determined to be effective.	5	DOE-RFPO agrees with the comment. §1.1.2 of the EA has been modified.
7.	§1.3: The Department does not agree with the statement that water depletion issues are outside the scope of this document. Such an issue is in the scope of this document as it affects, and is a consideration in judging, the proposed remedial actions.	2	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Scope of Analysis in Environmental Assessment.
8.	§2.0: This section is incomplete. The Range of alternatives for the C-series ponds is missing.	1	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Non-Related Surface Water Structures.
9.	§2.3.1, Page 14, Modify Interior Ponds: We concur with the installation of an adjustable stop-log structure.	25	Comment Noted.
10.	The proposal for armoring parts of the drainage above and below the dam is an engineering solution for a potential erosion problem. The Department has no objection.	25	Comment Noted.

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
11.	Page 15: The discussion of the staging area brings up the issue of short-term impacts because of construction. Just saying you will do a good job doesn't make it so. Where will material be staged for construction, maintenance, monitoring, security, etc?	24	As stated in §2.1.3 the EA, "staging of construction materials and equipment would be planned to avoid if possible, or to create the minimal disturbance possible to wetlands and sensitive habitat." The management and staging of materials will be determined during the design and the development of the detailed construction work control procedures for the modifications of the pond dams. In addition, the minimization of impacts will be controlled through the conditions contained in the USFWS Biological Opinion for work within Preble's Meadow Jumping Mouse habitat. Jurisdictional wetland impacts would be minimized through conditions imposed by the USACE permitting process. Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Detailed Infrastructure and Operations.
12.	§2.l.4: The Department has no opposition to temporarily maintaining the bypass structures. The Department strongly disagrees that the impacts relating to maintenance and logistics are beyond the scope of this document. They are part and parcel of implementing a particular option. They will need to be addressed.	24	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Detailed Infrastructure and Operations.
13.	§2.2, Alternative Action: The alternative action described has several attractive aspects. Interior pond dams would be removed thus restoring sections of the drainage to a more stable long-term configuration. Maintenance would also be reduced, as would impacts due to maintenance and monitoring. However, wetlands areas will be significantly reduced. Sediment loading to the terminal ponds will be increased, as will maintenance to these ponds.	25	Comment Noted.
14.	§2.3, No action alternative: The Department understands that any NEPA alternatives analysis requires evaluation of the no-action alternative. However, we do not consider the no-action alternative to be an acceptable option.	25	Comment Noted.

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
15.	§3.1.4.2: The Department prefers abandoned culverts and storm drains be filled with inert material prior to abandonment. The ends can then be plugged.	6	Recent discussions between the DOE, K-H, EPA and CDPHE have identified only a few culverts that will remain in the IA and that will need to be addressed during RFETS closure. Closure of each remaining, inactive culvert will be reviewed to determine the best approach; either plugging the entire length, filling the ends or crushing the culvert in-place are some of the options under consideration.
16.	§3.1.4.3: Erosion protection in drainages established in the former IA is preferred. The potential for erosion in areas of possible higher actinide concentrations should be reduced for as long a period of time as practicable.	9	The two major drainages into North and South Walnut Creek will be re-established for drainage of the IA after closure. The other functional channels, as shown on the IA Conceptual Grading Plan, have been established considering factors that impact surface water quality, erosion and overall land configuration grading. Aggressive erosion control measures are currently being taken in areas where soils are disturbed, particularly in areas where actinide migration is of concern. These specific actions are related to RFCA remedial actions and are outside the scope of actions considered in the EA.
17.	Figure 3-1, IA Grading and Drainage Plan: CDPHE has not yet concurred with the final land configuration for the Industrial Area (IA). The figure presented is adequate for general discussion, but some important configurations may be modified in the final version.	9	DOE-RFPO understands that the IA Grading and Drainage Plan has been referenced in the EA for general discussion, and specific land configuration design may change from the referenced version of the document.
18.	§4.0: The location of quarrying and storage and conveyance of municipal water supplies needs to be described more clearly. This area is between the plant site and Highway 93, not west of Highway 93.	22	DOE-RFPO agrees with the comment. §4.0 has been modified.
19.	§4.2.1.2: Clarify what is being discussed in this section: POE or POC. The requirements differ between these points.	7	As included in the text in §4.2.1.2, both POE (SW093 and GS10) and POC (GS08 and GS11) are discussed. The data reported for each individual station relate to the requirements of either a POE or a POC.
20.	§5.1: The Department expects major contaminated-sediment removal from some of the interior ponds. The Report poses the proposition that any construction on the interior ponds will be minor and the subsequent impact will also be minor. A more realistic evaluation of the activities at the ponds needs to be presented.	8	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Scope of Analysis in Environmental Assessment.

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
21.	§5.1.1.2, Wildlife: Upon what evidence does DOE base the projected return of wildlife after project completion?	4	The impacts are based on 10 years of observations of wildlife and wildlife data collected at the Site. Observations from other project activities at the Site have indicated that the wildlife return to disturbed areas after project completion. Additionally, from a historical perspective, the ponds were not part of the original Site, but installed after DOE acquired the Site. Therefore the wildlife that now exists around the ponds and utilizes the resources that are present have come in and made use of the available niches that were created. The same thing will occur after the pond activities are completed.
22.	§5.1.2.1, Water Resources: The Department concurs, and expects, that an engineering analysis will be performed to assess the impacts of routing flows through modified drainages. Evaluation of changes to the surface water regime will not end with this effort, but will continue through and beyond Site closure.	25	Comment Noted – As stated in §5.1.2.1, engineering analyses will be performed "to assess the impacts of routing flood flows through the modified drainage."
23.	§5.1.2.2, Air Resources: The problem of fugitive dust emissions is addressed in this section of the report. Missing is any discussion of the potential impact of suspended actinides in the dust. While risk issues associated with PM_{10} are dealt with, the additional risk associated with actinides is not addressed and should be addressed.	23	As noted in the EA, RFCA remedial activities in the area are assumed to have been completed prior to pond configuration activities. Thus, the soils in the area are not expected to contain contaminants in excess of RFCA allowed levels (soils < 50 pCi/g radionuclide). Air quality impacts were considered when the RFCA soil action levels were established.
24.	§5.3: As stated above, the Department considers the no-action alternative to not be viable.	25	Comment Noted.
June 15, 2004 USEPA Letter			
1.	EPA has concerns about the timing of the proposal to notch or remove the dams for all or some of the ponds along North and South Walnut Creeks. The proposed actions seem premature, as the ponds may need to be cleaned up under CERCLA. We therefore, recommend completing the CERCLA actions prior to any work on notching the dams or removing the ponds. At a minimum, the proposed action will need to demonstrate compliance with the Rocky Flats Cleanup Agreement (RFCA) and CERCLA.	15	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Timing of Release of Environmental Assessment.

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
2.	From the information available, it appears that the ponds were created to capture and retain contaminated sediments to avoid the release of sediments to the local communities drinking water reservoirs, and they are part of the wastewater system. Typically, wastewater treatment systems contaminated by hazardous wastes are considered CERCLA units. The series A and B ponds were sampled about 10 years ago, and showed radioactivity in the sediments and the Walnut Creek Drainages were identified for CERCLA purposes as Operable Unit 6 (OU 6). The State has also taken surface water samples at the ponds, and pond B-2 shows inflow of volatile organic carbons (VOCs). In 1995 a CERCLA RFI/RI report for OU 6 was almost completed but not agreed to by either EPA or CDPHE. To date, the potential cleanup of OU 6 has been a lower priority for Rocky Flats and no CERCLA decisions have been completed regarding remedial action or "no further action" for OU 6.	5,12	DOE-RFPO agrees that the ponds serve as a safeguard for water quality and are not anticipated to be part of the final RFCA remedy. §1.1.2 of the EA has been modified. Pond sediment remediation actions will be completed under CERCLA (via the Environmental Restoration RSOP) and are outside the scope of the EA. The onset of these remedial actions is scheduled for FY2005. Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Scope of Analysis in Environmental Assessment.
3.	The disturbance or removals of the dams and the resulting changes in hydraulics also have the potential to release contaminated sediments impacting the environment. The Environmental Assessment (EA) did not analyze these impacts. Please note, as discussed above, we recommend that these impacts be addressed as part of the CERCLA investigation. However, if the proposed dam notching/removal activities proceed before the CERCLA investigation, then the impacts would need to be analyzed in the EA and evaluated for significance before preparing the Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI).	11,15	As noted in the EA, RFCA remedial activities in the area are assumed to have been completed prior to pond configuration activities. Thus, the soils in the area will not contain contaminants in excess of RFCA action levels.
4.	Contaminant information was not included in the Environmental Assessment. The release of contaminated sediment is the most likely significant environmental impact of the proposed project. The source(s), and fate and transport of the VOCs are currently being investigated under CERCLA. The environmental analysis of potential impacts should include sampling and analysis of the pond sediments, evaluation of data adequacy, assessment of the fate and transport of contaminants, evaluation of existing contamination relative to ecological benchmarks, and evaluation of remediation of the pond sediments should be done before remedial alternatives can be meaningfully compared and a preferred option selected. [As mentioned above, our main recommendation is to complete these types of analyses under CERCLA.]	8, 12, 19	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Scope of Analysis in Environmental Assessment and Timing of Release of Environmental Assessment.

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
5.	The Wildlife Worker Action Levels are not the only factors that should be considered when analyzing the environmental impacts to human health for the proposed action. These action levels only consider exposures to wildlife workers on the site and do not consider the impacts to offsite communities and the natural environment.	22	The Wildlife Worker Action Levels are established as protective of the most impacted individual and bound impacts to any off-site communities. Impacts to the environment are analyzed in Sections 5.0 and 6.0 of the EA outside of the human health impact analysis and consider the impacts of the actions on air quality, water quality, and ecological resources. Additionally, as stated in the Cumulative Impacts sections of the EA, "impacts associated with actions analyzed in the EA would be limited to the immediate Site area, would not be significant, and would be temporary in nature."
6.	The Environmental Assessment did not analyze the potential ecological (aquatic life and wildlife) impacts of the alternatives. An ecological risk assessment is currently being developed for Rocky Flats under CERCLA.	4	Sections 5.1.1.2 and 5.2.1.2 of the EA contain the potential ecological impacts of the proposed alternative actions. Other potential ecological affects were discussed under the Biological Resources section of each action or alternative that was analyzed.
7.	In addition to the concerns of possible contamination in the sediments, the dam structures themselves may contain contamination. The soil in the dams has not been tested and could also be contaminated due to historic entrainment of contaminants. These structures were created as detention ponds and a 1986 DOE report states: "prior to 1979 some of the ponds were used to hold various wastes that contained nitrates and low levels of radioactivity." The Environmental Assessment needs to identify what measures will be taken to identify the extent of contamination and the measures will be taken to protect human health and the environment.	17, 19	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Waste Characterization and Disposal.
8.	Several sections of the Environmental Assessment identify water treatment (sediment removal) as one of the purposes and needs for retaining some or all of the ponds. Please keep in mind that in the long-term, the ponds are not part of the CERCLA remedy for the site and cannot be used for treating water that exceeds action levels.	5, 25	DOE-RFPO agrees that the ponds serve as a safeguard for water quality and are not anticipated to be part of the final RFCA remedy. §1.1.2 of the EA has been modified.

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
June 15, 2004 USFWS Letter			
1.	The Service believes that the EA is well written and addresses the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) adequately in most areas. However, adequate data and analysis that supports a conclusion for no further action at the ponds under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) has not been presented. The premise for the ponds presented in the document is premature because a CERCLA remedy has not been finalized. Therefore, any determinations made pursuant to NEPA do not replace or preclude future remedy decisions that must be determined under CERCLA, and if the DOE determines that the issue should be submitted under NEPA rather than under CERCLA, then the EA should be submitted after all the CERCLA remedy decisions have been made at the site.	15	The actions described in the EA are not CERCLA/RFCA remedial actions and are thus analyzed outside the purview of RFCA. Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Timing of Release of Environmental Assessment.
2.	Once the CERCLA actions have taken place at the ponds, then the EA should be resubmitted for consideration. At that time, a full review should take place.	25	Comment Noted. Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Timing of Release of Environmental Assessment.
3.	Submitting this action under NEPA does not allow for consideration of ecologically protective contaminant levels in the ponds. Sediment data has not been presented in the EA. The quality of the data for making a determination that sediment is below the Wildlife Refuge Worker Action Levels is not adequately supported, and is an issue that is more properly addressed under CERCLA rather than through the NEPA process. Further, the NEPA analysis presented does not specifically and adequately evaluate technical risks of a change in the dam structures disrupting or modifying the composition of contaminants in sediment. This is especially true if the concentrations of contaminants are shifted with the deeper sediments becoming upheaved thereby working their way to the surface and resulting in increased exposure to humans and biota. Therefore the fate and transport of contaminated sediments from the ponds may be changed for the worse as a result of taking action to notch the dams. The dam action therefore should be considered under CERCLA, rather than NEPA, in order to properly address contamination issues associated with the ponds.	8,10	As noted in the EA, RFCA remedial activities in the area are assumed to have been completed prior to pond configuration activities. Thus, the soils in the area will not contain contaminants in excess of RFCA allowed levels. Actions associated with the remediation of sediments in the ponds and other contaminated soils are outside the scope of the EA. Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Scope of Analysis in Environmental Assessment and Timing of Release of Environmental Assessment.

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
4.	The soil material comprising the dams has not been tested, but could be significantly contaminated. The structures were created as detention ponds at least 10 years ago, and high levels of hazardous substances may have seeped into the dam faces. Risk to workers responsible for alterations/construction on the dams for this proposed action should be considered and the ultimate disposal or placement of soils being removed from the dams should be adequately addressed under the CERCLA process. This issue would not be considered or assessed under NEPA.	17	As noted in the EA, RFCA remedial activities in the area are assumed to have been completed prior to pond configuration activities. Thus, the soils in the area will not contain contaminants in excess of RFCA allowed levels. Actions associated with the remediation of sediments in the ponds and other contaminated soils are outside the scope of the EA. Proposed actions will be protective of workers as work will be completed under the purview of the Site's comprehensive health and safety program. Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Waste Characterization and Disposal.
5.	Final land configuration issues for Rocky Flats are still progressing with the Rocky Flats Cleanup Agreement (RFCA) partners. Submitting this as a NEPA action is inappropriate since there are many contaminants and site-wide hydrology considerations yet to properly be resolved under CERCLA.	9	The EA assumes that the actions described will follow the completion of RFCA remedial actions in these areas, and thus the analysis of the actions is appropriate under NEPA. DOE-RFPO is unaware of any remaining issues with the land configuration that have not been resolved. Please provide specific USFWS comments to DOE-RFPO on these issues.
6.	The ecological risk assessment for sediments in the ponds has yet to be completed. It is possible that one alternative for handling this issue is that the sediment must be removed. Final decisions related to dam configuration for these ponds are affected by: (a) the contaminant levels present in the sediment; (b) assessment of future ecological exposures; and (c) the future land use of the site as a Refuge.	4	As noted in the EA, RFCA remedial activities in the area are assumed to have been completed prior to pond configuration activities. Specific engineering design of the modified dams will account for RFCA decisions related to pond sediment remediation. Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Scope of Analysis in Environmental Assessment.

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
7.	The EA contains a lot of applicable information for an Interim Measure/Interim Remedial Action (IM/IRA) but the EA should be revised to include an assessment that also is based on ecological risk and addresses the congressionally mandated future use of the site as a National Wildlife Refuge. The requirements of NEPA automatically addressed under the CERCLA process are also addressed under the National Dam Safety Program, a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) responsibility, which is a location-specific applicable or relevant appropriate requirement (ARAR). If there are significant dam safety issues that need to be immediately addressed, then only the dam stabilization issues should be considered as a requirement under the Dam Safety Program. Therefore**,** any action associated with the dams is properly accomplished pursuant to CERCLA.	4, 10	The ponds serve as a safeguard for water quality and are not anticipated to be part of the final RFCA remedy. As such, an analysis of the environmental impacts of proposed activities is properly accomplished under NEPA. Impacts to site ecology have been evaluated and are included in the EA.
8.	A number of concerns have been expressed regarding changes to hydrology of the drainages. There are opportunities to partially offset these reductions and maximize the utilization and retention of the remaining water flows: 1) minimize use of rip rap because it would cause a loss of useable habitat, 2) minimize retention of concrete water structures and dams, 3) create "natural" water retention areas (i.e. backup water at drop structures). Less maintenance would be required for more natural drainage and functional riparian configuration. The site could utilize clean soil material in dams in other remedy projects.	11, 25	DOE-RFPO concurs with the comment. Erosion controls will be necessary but will be minimized to the extent practicable. Minimal water retention structures are to be maintained. The proposed action is aimed at creating more “natural” water retention areas.
9.	Page 3, Section 1.1.2: The paragraph states that when observed collectively, the North and South Walnut Creek ponds remove approximately 70 to 85 percent of the Plutonium and Americium that enters the ponds in surface water. This makes the ponds sound like they are definitely treatment ponds and part of the remedy. Explain how, even as this removal is taking place, that the ponds are not a part of a treatment system for surface water.	5	The ponds serve as a safeguard for water quality and are not anticipated to be part of the final RFCA remedy. §1.1.2 of the EA has been modified.

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
10.	Page 4, Terminal pond discharge: Reference is made to quality control for discharges from the terminal Ponds A-4 and B-5 downstream. This would continue to be accomplished, as it currently is being done, by sampling the water in the pond, and if downstream surface-water quality criteria are met, releasing the water to North or South Walnut Creek. The Service recommends the surface water quality criteria for discharges downstream from the terminal ponds be included as part of the document. The Service also recommends including contingency plans to prevent sedimentation and/or contamination downstream for a 100- or 500-year flood event.	24	Contaminant monitoring is within the purview of RFCA and is outside the scope of the EA. Monitoring requirements are described in the Integrated Monitoring Plan, and post-closure monitoring requirements will be addressed in a Closure Integrated Monitoring Plan. Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Detailed Infrastructure and Operations.
11.	Page 6, Section 1.2: Under Purpose and Need, the statement is made in the last paragraph that, "Other activities have been identified that may have impacts to the environmental resources analyzed in this EA. These activities are primarily governed by CERCLA…and are outside the scope of this EA." Thus, the action is to change and stabilize dam structures (as opposed to removing sediments). DOE interprets this as a non-CERCLA action since it does not deal with the contamination in the ponds, only the detention structures that create the ponds. Therefore, it is clear that this EA does not address sediment as part of the Affected Environment and as a result Environmental Effects of the Alternatives on sediments are not analyzed. Given the probable occurrence of significant levels of contaminants occurring in the sediments at the bottom of the ponds, changes to the sediments that can occur over time under the proposed action due to reduced water availability and resultant increased exposure, and flows through all ponds except the terminal ponds, the Service recommends that pond sediments be addressed as part of the Affected Environment and analyzed under Environmental Effects.	8	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Scope of Analysis in Environmental Assessment.
12.	Under this same section, it states that configuration of the Site to a stable and more functional state would be consistent with the Site's transfer to the Service for use as a National Wildlife Refuge. However, the Service would recommend that the dams be either completely removed or left in a low-head flow-through system configuration to be stable and more functional ecologically. This would allow for increased sinuosity and small detention areas.	10	DOE-RFPO concurs with the comment. The proposed action will convert dams to a low-head flow-through system with future operational flexibility to control the water level. Total removal of the dams would significantly reduce the wetland habitat from "baseline" conditions and is not consistent with the three objectives presented in §2.0 of the EA.

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
13.	Page 9, Section 1.3: Please add a timeline expected for water and habitats to equilibrate.	4	Comment Noted. A specific timeline for habitats to equilibrate after water depletion was not determined due to a number of variable factors that will impact that timeline (including future climate). The water depletion issues and associated effects are beyond the scope of this EA.
14.	Page 13, Section 2.1.2: Due to the decreased expected water in North Walnut creek, the Service recommends that pond A-3 be removed as well. We do not believe that isolating A-4 needs to be a priority in the future. Pond A-4 will have sufficient capacity to handle even a hundred-year storm.	22	DOE-RFPO disagrees with the comment. Current operations allow Pond A-4 to be isolated while being discharged. Maintaining Pond A-3 allows for operational flexibility and increased safeguards for water quality.
15.	Page 13, Section 2.1.3: The Service feels strongly that notching the dams is not a permanent solution to the pond configuration. The Service would recommend that the dams be either completely removed or left in a low-head flow-through system configuration to be stable and more functional ecologically. This configuration will still allow for wetlands upstream and more Preble's meadow jumping mouse habitat.	10	DOE-RFPO disagrees with the comment. The proposed action will convert dams to a low-head flow-through system with future operational flexibility to control the water level. Total removal of the dams would significantly reduce the wetland habitat from "baseline" conditions and is not consistent with the three objectives presented in §2.0. Notching the dams will generally be protective of Preble's mouse habitat, as discussed in §5.1.1.2.
16.	Page 15, 3rd paragraph: The statement is made that removed dam material may be reused onsite (as fill material) outside of the Preble's habitat and wetlands, or shipped offsite. Has prior testing shown this material to be contaminated? If so, that information needs to be disclosed in this document and analyzed for possible human health effects, or more appropriately, under CERCLA.	17, 19	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Waste Characterization and Disposal.
17.	Page 16, Section 2.1.4: The bypass systems on both the A-series and the B-series ponds should be removed. The Service agrees that they can be kept for the near-term to divert water around the upstream ponds while they are being modified. However, once the upstream ponds are completed, the bypass systems should be removed. In the long-term, they will only represent a liability that will have to be dealt with later. Long-term maintenance must be considered when looking at these actions.	22	The proposed action is to maintain the bypass structures. The bypass structures will be available for future operational flexibility in the event that maintenance is required on the structures. These operational benefits outweigh any potential maintenance costs.

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
18.	Page 21, Section 3.0: The Service does not understand why there needs to be positive stormwater runoff in areas that do not have residual contamination in the Industrial Area. Why can't the water just percolate into the soil? Contours do not have to be large either; small contours may suffice to get water moving.	22	Much of the IA is contoured to allow storm water to percolate into the ground; however, physical drainages into North and South Walnut Creek still exist at the IA. Grading within the IA is used to direct overland flow of storm water into these major channels and to control overall erosion within the IA. This prevents flows from being concentrated in steep areas where erosion would be excessive. Drainage into North and South Walnut creek will be re-established by the removal of major culverts that now exist in each of these drainages.
19.	Page 21, Section 3.1.1: After asphalt removal, the roads should be ripped with a dozer or grader. After ripping, the roads should be graded. As the roads are graded, it would be very easy to grade soil into the adjacent drainage ditches and graded to match the surrounding topography. The process would be quick and fairly inexpensive.	22	Ditches along the roadways and parking areas will be evaluated as each road or parking area is removed. Generally, grading and the mixing of the roadbase with the existing soil will provide sufficient material to use as fill if required to fill areas determined to be filled (like small ditches).
20.	Page 21, Section 3.1.2: The establishment of the drainage west of building 371/374 is mostly needed due to the establishment of the borrow area. The Service does not believe that the use of rip rap does not show that the design is a stable and more functional end state than a design that has lower slopes and is stabilized by vegetation or native willows.	9	The use of rip rap is for contingency erosion protection. The current plan is to cover the rip rap with soil to promote the growth of vegetation (including willows) for primary erosion protection.
21.	Page 22, Section 3.1.3: The Industrial Area Configuration as presented, is a return to where things were several months ago. Minimal contouring and channels with rip rap do not represent what the Service considers a stable and more functional ecological state. The Service continues to recommend the restoration of the drainage to the south and east of building 371/374. We also continue to recommend a more holistic approach to regrading for all of the Industrial Area once all of the buildings are removed.	9	Comment Noted. The use of rip rap is for contingency erosion protection. The current plan is to cover the rip rap with soil to promote the growth of vegetation (including willows) for primary erosion protection.

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
22.	Page 53, Section 5.1.1.1: Pond A-1 would have water if the bypass would be removed after the dams were modified. For all cases, the supply of water is reduced, but the capacities of the ponds are not, except maybe for pond A-2. The amount of wetlands around the ponds can be modified as the dams are modified. The entire drainage system needs to be looked at as a whole not at each individual pond.	13, 22	DOE-RFPO concurs that Pond A-1 would have water if the bypass would be removed after the dam is modified. Notching the dams will reduce the capacity of the ponds, and the structures will allow for future changes in pond level to be made if desired (and subsequent changes to wetland habitat). Wetland impacts were measured at each individual pond in order to arrive at a conclusive statement on impacts to wetlands for the entire system (see §5.2.1.1).
23.	Page 56, Section 5.1.1.2: Preble's meadow jumping mouse impacts can be mitigated. Other migratory birds must be considered as well.	4	Potential impacts and mitigation issues to the Preble's Mouse have been addressed in the 2004 Programmatic Biological Assessment. Migratory birds and their nesting are addressed through the Site's migratory bird procedure that requires nest surveys to be conducted to determine if active nests are present.
24.	Page 57, Section 5.1.1.2: The statement about the use of heavy equipment use in PMJM habitat during active season is a very hard statement to prove.	4	Comment Noted. This issue was discussed with the USFWS during the consultation process for the 2004 Programmatic Biological Assessment. §5.1.1.2 has been modified to reflect the results of the consultation process.
25.	Page 58, Section 5.1.2.1: Several sections call for engineering analyses or augmentation plans. When will these be done?	24	Detailed engineering analyses and infrastructure/operations plans will proceed the construction of the modified dams. Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Detailed Infrastructure and Operations.
26.	Page 63, Section 5.2.1: The resulting habitat size and function would depend on how the reconstruction of the stream channel was done. There could be minimal wetland loss, or total wetland loss depending on the design.	25	Comment Noted.
27.	Page 71, Section 5.6: DOE must consult with the Service on the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act as well.	25	Comment Noted.
May 20, 2004 FEMA Letter			
1.	Since the proposed project that has been defined in the draft EA would appear to have potential impacts on wetlands, a discussion on compliance specific to the requirements of Executive Order 11990 – Protection of Wetlands – would seem appropriate in the final EA.	22	DOE-RFPO concurs with the comment and has modified §1.0 of the EA.

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
2.	Since the proposed project that has been defined in the draft EA would appear to have potential impacts on floodplains, a discussion on compliance specific to the requirements of Executive Order 11988 – Floodplain Management – and implementation of the planning process as defined in Section 2 of the EO would seem appropriate in the final EA.	22	DOE-RFPO concurs with the comment and has modified §1.0 of the EA.
3.	I am under the impression that the Rocky Flats facility is on federal land and as such, is not subject to the floodplain management regulations adopted by Jefferson County as a condition for participation in the National Flood Insurance Program. I would, however suggest that the final EA have a discussion specific to DOE's compliance with Section 3 of EO 11988 in order to disclose compliance with that portion of the EO as well.	22	DOE-RFPO concurs with the comment and has modified §1.0 of the EA. Additionally, a voluntary Master Drainage Plan was completed for the Site in 1992.
4.	I realize that the above topics are covered under 10 CFR 1022 of DOE's regulations, however I do feel that a more obvious disclosure of the requirements of the Executive Orders and DOE's compliance with them, would benefit the final EA and the reader of that document.	22	DOE-RFPO concurs with the comment and has modified §1.0 of the EA.
June 3, 2004 RFCAB Letter			
1.	The Board thinks the EA is premature. We believe the remediation of Ponds B-1, B-2, and B-3 must be accomplished before decisions on reconfiguration of the ponds are made. Therefore, the document addressing the remediation of the ponds should have been released prior to the EA. We also think the Ponds B-1, B-2, and B-3 remediation plan should be released for public comment and not merely published as a notification. The Board also believes the EA should have included plans for all of the series ponds, including Ponds C-1 and C-2 in the Woman Creek drainage.	1, 15	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Timing of Release of Environmental Assessment, Scope of Analysis in Environmental Assessment, and Exclusion of Non-Related Surface Water Structures.
2.	The Board recommends a final decision on the EA be delayed until the remediation plan is published. We also recommend the remediation plan for the sediments in Ponds B-1, B-2, and B-3 be released for public comment rather than published as an Environmental Remediation Rocky Flats Cleanup Agreement Standard Operating Protocol (ER RSOP) notification.	15	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Timing of Release of Environmental Assessment.

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
3.	We recommend that in the EA the Site include a discussion of its findings and actions for Ponds C-1 and C-2 in the Woman Creek drainage. If the Site decides not to include actions for Ponds C-1 and C-2 in the EA, we would request the Site provide a justification for not including this pond series.	1	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Non-Related Surface Water Structures.
4.	We thank the Site for maps of data on radionuclide contamination in the sediments of the ponds and the South Interceptor Ditch. The Board makes an additional request for data on chemicals and volatile organic compounds in the sediments in all of the series ponds, including Ponds C-1 and C-2.	21	The subject data was not provided as part of the EA. The additional requested data does not fall within the scope of actions considered in the EA.
5.	The Board is concerned with wetlands in the pond system. Because the amount of water to the pond system will be sharply reduced, wetlands may not be sustainable. Water levels and soil types should determine which plant communities and ecosystems are sustainable in the reduced-water environment that is envisioned in the EA. It may be less labor intensive and less costly to first determine the appropriate and sustainable ecosystem and plant types that will be self-sustaining. The Site may save money and time in the end if it hired consultants to determine what types of plants would be sustainable in that area. Also, because plant communities can take years to become established, we are concerned that the EA does not state who will monitor the vegetation post-closure and the actions that would be taken if the plant communities fail to establish themselves in the area.	2, 4, 13, 24	DOE-RFPO anticipates that the wetland functions and areas will be diminished in certain ponds (A-1, B-1, and B-3) as a result of the proposed action and as a result of the reduction in available water following closure. In these areas, obligate wetland species would be replaced by facultative wetland species or upland species, depending on the availability of water. This shift in species composition is expected to occur naturally; DOE-RFPO is not anticipating planting wetland species. As there is a possibility for invasion of noxious weeds in newly-exposed areas, appropriate control measures will be implemented. Long-term management of areas that will be retained by DOE-RFPO following Site closure (retained lands are anticipated to include the pond systems) will be the responsibility of the DOE office of Legacy Management. These responsibilities will include vegetation and wetland management as needed.
6.	Therefore, the Board recommends the Site hire an expert to study the revegetation of the pond system with an eye towards establishing an ecosystem and plant communities that would be appropriate for a reduced water environment. It may not be appropriate to attempt to re-establish a wetland environment in those areas because the amount of water to the pond system will be sharply reduced.	25	Comment Noted. Re-establishment of wetlands systems is not planned; rather preservation of wetlands that future water availability will support is desired.

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
7.	The Board requests the Site include in the EA its plans for post-closure monitoring of the vegetation and to delineate the entity or person who will be responsible for the monitoring. We also recommend the Site include actions it intends to take if the revegetation of the pond system is not successful.	20	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Detailed Infrastructure and Operations.
8.	With respect to the actions to be taken, the Board has several comments on the pond system. In particular, the Board believes a more natural pond system should be established as an end result. A more natural flow-through system would be less disruptive to the environment.	22	DOE-RFPO disagrees with the comment as the proposed action is consistent with the desire for a post-closure drainage system that requires less active management and maintenance than the current system while preserving wetlands and habitat as available water allows. The proposed action will provide for a more natural flow-through of surface water occurring through the Walnut Creek interior ponds. The terminal ponds are being kept in place as a safeguard for water quality in order to be protective of downstream stakeholders.
9.	The EA discusses whether to maintain the diversion of water around the upper B-series ponds. Water will be diverted while vegetation is being established. After the vegetation is well established in the modified drainages, the by-pass could be reconfigured to divert runoff directly through the modified interior ponds. How will this be determined and who will decide?	24	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Detailed Infrastructure and Operations.
10.	The EA states "The Pond-A-2 average pool elevation was assumed to be lowered in the proposed action by approximately 6 feet." We request the Site provide justification for this assumption.	10	Please refer to Response to Groups of Similar Comments – Lowering of the A-2 Dam by 6 Feet.
11.	The Board believes a long-term strategy for pond management should include natural flow through the terminal ponds. Currently, water is held in the terminal ponds and released in batches. The Board recommends that the Site work with local governments to determine the conditions for natural flow through the drainages and the Site develop a long-term strategy that includes (1) modifying the current pond system to a more passive and natural flow system that continues to be protective of human health and the environment; (2) accommodating and managing the impacts of anticipated reduced flow, and (3) protecting surface water and the ecology.	24	Comment Noted. The proposed action in the EA retains the terminal ponds and operation consistent with current practices (batch release).

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
12.	The document states drainage ditches next to roads would not be regraded. This appears to be in conflict with the Land Configuration Map, which would require extensive regrading. We request the Site provide a justification for the statement in the EA that the drainage ditches next to roads would not be regraded.	9	Ditches along the roadways and parking areas will be evaluated as each road or parking area is removed. Ditches will be removed, remain, or be re-configured as swales as determined in the specific grading of an area. Language in §3.1.1 has been updated.
13.	The document states that asphalt will be removed from the *major* access roads to the site and the north perimeter road. However, it is our understanding that asphalt will be removed from all roads. The board requests the statement in the document be clarified or changed to reflect that all asphalt will be removed.	22	DOE-RFPO agrees with the comment. §3.1.1 of the EA was modified.
14.	The EA states some culverts will be removed and others will remain. The Board requests the site provide a justification and the criteria as to why some culverts will remain and some not.	6	One culvert will remain in the drainage area between B371 and B771 because the removal of this culvert will destroy an area of well established environmental habitat. All other culverts will be removed or rendered ineffective by plugging, filling, or crushing.
15.	The EA states that culverts that will remain will be plugged at each end. The Board's concern is that there will be slumping in the middle of the culverts with the consequent subsidence of the landscape. The Board requests the Site discuss this in the EA and discuss removing all the culverts or implementing other methods of closing the culverts so that subsidence will not occur.	6	Recent discussions between the DOE, K-H, EPA and CDPHE have identified only a few culverts that will remain in the IA and that will need to be addressed during RFETS closure. Each remaining, inactive culvert will be reviewed to determine the best approach; either plugging the entire length, filling the ends or crushing the culvert in-place are some of the options under consideration.
16.	The Industrial Area was built on a pediment surface. The Board is concerned that modifying that surface could lead to erosion and potentially expose subsurface contamination. The Board generally endorses the regrading plan in the EA in that it attempts to return the natural drainage pattern. We request the Site continue to study the regrading in order to minimize further erosion.	9, 25	Engineering controls to reduce erosion are planned on areas that are disturbed during the regrading process.
17.	Past studies have shown that surface runoff on slopes contributes to surface water contamination downstream. The Board recommends that the regrading plan concept and its implementation take special care to prevent any residual plutonium contamination from being eroded into surface water – either from the planned final configuration slopes or potential future slopes created by erosion.	9	Engineering controls to reduce erosion are planned on areas that are disturbed including the slopes of the functional channels and major building backfills during the regrading process.

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
18.	The Board is concerned that if water is allowed to percolate through buildings with residual contamination, over time it may liberate the contamination and allow it to move into groundwater. The Board recommends that the land configuration plan encourage runoff to flow around any building sites, such as those now occupied by Buildings 371 and 771, that may contain residual contamination. The Board also recommends that special care be taken to minimize water flow through any remaining underground structures and pipes.	9	Structures with residual contamination, as described in the B771 DOP for example, will be covered with at least 6 feet of soil. Piping (for example Old Process Waste Lines and Sanitary Sewers) will be disrupted to reduce the flow through and around the buried piping.
19.	The EA states "Fish can be found in the intermittent streams and most ponds at the Site. Common species include fathead minnows (Pimephales promelas), creek chubs (Semotilus atromaculatus), and an occasional small-mouth (Micropterus dolomieui) and large-mouth (M. salmoides) bass." Given that the fish are in the streams and ponds and the sediments in the ponds may be contaminated with radionuclides, we recommend that before the Site drains the ponds, it test a representative sample of the fish for radionuclide contamination. If the fish are contaminated, they need to be disposed of properly and not allowed to contaminate the food chain. The Board requests results from any analyses for radionuclide or chemical contamination in the fish.	4, 8, 21	Comment Noted. Pond RFCA remedial actions are assumed to have been completed prior to the onset of pond configuration activities, and the issue of potential contaminated biota is beyond the scope of this EA. Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Scope of Analysis in Environmental Assessment.
20.	The EA states some of the material in the dams may be used on site or shipped offsite. The Board requests the Site provide the criteria and justification for deciding whether the dam material is used on site or is shipped off-site.	17, 19	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Waste Characterization and Disposal.
21.	The Board recommends the Site study how the decrease in surface water quantity will affect surface water quality.	22	Comment Noted. DOE-RFPO has examined erosion analyses that indicate as water quantity is reduced, erosion of soils potentially containing radionuclides will be reduced. However, despite the fact that the total radionuclide load will be reduced, water quantity reductions may also result in a concentrating effect. It should also be noted that RFCA activities (environmental remediation) will also reduce the available radionuclide contamination levels available to enter the water system.
22.	There is a 100-year flood plain map on Page 8 of the document. The Board requests the Site provide the date of the map.	22	The date of the map in Figure 4-1 is included and is April 13, 2004.

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
23.	Lastly, in several places the document lacks clarity and should be edited. While this may seem a small point, there are places in the document where it is not clear what the Site intends to do. There are also many places in the document where there is no justification provided for actions that are planned to be taken. The Board, therefore, requests the document be edited with attention paid to clarity of ideas, justification of actions, spelling, and grammar.	25	Comment Noted.
June 2, 2004 RFCLOG E-mail			
1.	Our primary concern is that the document doesn't address the issue of pond sediment remediation. Instead, the scope of this EA is divided into two, limited NEPA analyses. The first analysis is for the post-closure configuration of the A and B series ponds (no mention of C-series ponds). The second analysis is of proposed non-CERCLA actions to return the Site to a stable and more functional configuration (removal of asphalt from roads/parking lots, excavating/grading activities in the IA, removal or plugging of many culverts and storm drains, creation of functional channels to direct stormwater, etc.). Without the incorporation of an analysis of pond sediment remediation activities, the EA scope doesn't sufficiently analyze the potential impacts to habitat in the pond drainages (e.g. wetlands) and potential effects on the dam notching caused by removal of pond sediment. Instead the EA states on page 7, *"Potential activities that may require further environmental analysis include: Removal of sediment within interior ponds if action levels are exceeded:*	1, 2, 8, 15	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Scope of Analysis in Environmental Assessment and Exclusion of Non-Related Surface Water Structures.

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
2.	As several members of the Coalition Board expressed at the February 23, 2004 Board meeting, http://rfclog.org/Minutes/2-23-04mn.htm, there is a concern that the Site is practicing bifurcated planning whereby only impacts to the pond drainage habitat are analyzed in the EA as a result of notching certain interior dams. Environmental impacts to the pond drainages due to sediment remediation activities are relegated to another, yet-to-be-identified document (which may not require public comment). We believe Kaiser-Hill will request the use of the routine ER RSOP for Soil Remediation for the sediment remediation activities. Regardless of the type of document, it must be subject to public comment and have sufficient analysis so that the Coalition Board can analyze whether the plan is protective of the environment, especially considering the narrow confines of the terrain surrounding the B-series interior ponds. Informal discussions with the RFCA parties concerning the level of detail for the sediment remediation document would suggest that due to the non-routine nature of the remediation, a more robust ER RSOP would be appropriate. For example, due to the areal extent of the existing actinide contamination in B2 pond sediment above RFCA action levels, removal of the entire pond sediment surface area may be required. Impacts to the environment from an extensive effort such as this example need to be adequately addressed.	1, 8, 15	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Scope of Analysis in Environmental Assessment.
3.	Finally, we are aware of a past Site practice whereby water from the more contaminated B-2 was pumped into the less contaminated A2 (potential cross-contamination issue). The Site is not planning on any sediment remediation in the A-series ponds based on characterization data. A question we have for the Site is, did the characterization data for A2 include any sediment samples taken from the vicinity where B2 water entered A2? We ask this question to ensure that pond A2 sediment has been adequately characterized and that there are no areas of sediment contamination in A2 that would trigger RFCA remediation.	17, 19	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Waste Characterization and Disposal and Scope of Analysis in Environmental Assessment.

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
June 9, 2004 Westminster Letter			
1.	We are concerned that the site continues to practice a piecemeal approach to a remedy vs. a holistic approach. Westminster expected the details of the proposed plan to include characterization of the ponds and drainages, engineered designs, inclusion of the "A", "B" and "C" series ponds, the SID and modeling results. This information is not fully contained in the document. In fact, there is no discussion of the "C" series ponds or the SID in the document.	1	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Non-Related Surface Water Structures, Scope of Analysis in Environmental Assessment, and Exclusion of Detailed Infrastructure and Operations.
2.	We understand there are many uncertainties concerning the Original Landfill, the Ash Pits being left in place and whether the areas surrounding the Woman Creek drainage are free of contamination below the Rocky Flats Clean-up Agreement action levels. There is also conjecture as to whether underground contamination plumes, in the vicinity of the Original Landfill and due east to the 903 Lip area will be remedied. These plumes contain VOC's, radioactive constituents and could have an impact over time on the water quality in Woman Creek. Solvents, heavy metals, and radionuclides will remain in the soil in this area and it is imperative the ponds serve as settlement ponds to remove potential contaminants so that they do not migrate off-site into our community. Once again our issues pertaining to the Original Landfill and the potential impact to the Woman Creek drainage need to be resolved.	21	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Scope of Analysis in Environmental Assessment.
3.	Westminster expects DOE to include the SID and the C-Series Ponds reconfiguration in the *Pond and Land Configuration Environmental Assessment* document to allow Westminster and the Woman Creek Reservoir Authority (WCRA) an opportunity to review the Site's proposal holistically and provide a knowledgeable and informed assessment of future long-term management activities and obligations at the site.	1	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Non-Related Surface Water Structures.

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
4.	The following are items that must be incorporated to address our concerns for the "C" series ponds: • Provide justification as to why DOE did not include the C-I and C-2 ponds in the EA. • Revise the document to include the proposed alternative analysis for the ponds entering Woman Creek. • The document should also be revised to address the SID and any potential plans to restructure the SID. • Revise the document to provide assurances the ponds will remain post-closure. Also include language to keep downstream asset holders apprised of any activities associated with the operation and maintenance of the ponds and drainages systems.	1	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Non-Related Surface Water Structures.
5.	Westminster wants the document revised to include language that the ponds will not revert to a natural system of passive flow. As long as there is a potential for actinide migration from residual contamination in the IA, the terminal ponds shall be managed as batch and release ponds.	22	§2.1.1 and §2.2.1 of the EA reflect that the ponds will "continue to be operated using the batch-release protocol that is currently employed to manage discharges." The reader should note that the ponds serve as a safeguard for water quality and are not anticipated to be part of the final RFCA remedy.
6.	We recognize that our neighbors, the City & County of Broomfield, have voiced and documented their concerns that the Present Landfill pond waters/leachate continue to be transferred to the A-series ponds. Revise the document to include the Present Landfill Pond and the disposition alternatives for the pond.	22	Current operations involve the transfer of waters from the Present Landfill Pond to the A-series ponds. However, this practice is being discontinued, and waters from this pond will no longer enter the North Walnut Creek drainage. Analyses of this and other RFCA actions associated with the Present Landfill are contained in the IM/IRA for the Present Landfill. Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Scope of Analysis in Environmental Assessment.

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
7.	Westminster has continually voiced our opinion of the importance of the ponds and their purpose as a last measure of protection to our community to protect surface water quality. We ask to be kept apprised of any future activities associated with Woman Creek during this transition period. We would like to thank the Site for meeting with us on several occasions to discuss the proposed reconfiguration and we wish to continue the dialogue for a topic that is our greatest priority.	25	Comment Noted.
8.	§1.1.2, Page 2, *The Site presently maintains twelve retention ponds in multiple drainages. Only the nine ponds located in North and South Walnut Creeks are addressed here...*: The document does not provide any justification for not including all twelve ponds in the environmental assessment. Revise the document to include the other ponds or provide the justification for not including them in the EA.	1	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Non-Related Surface Water Structures.
9.	§1.1.2, Page 5, *...a buried pipeline exists to allow pumping of water between drainages. Similarly, aboveground pipelines exist between...*: There is no discussion in the document as to the disposition of these pipelines. Revise the document to include any disposition of the buried and above ground pipelines.	24	Surface piping and piping buried less than three feet below final grade will be removed. However, some piping between the A-series and B-series ponds will remain for a period of time after site closure for the management of surface water.
10.	§1.2, Page 6, *To accomplish this long-term responsibility, the drainage system should require less active management and maintenance than the current system.*: Revise the document to provide the rationale for this statement. Why or how will a less active management and maintenance system enhance ecological or environmental aspects? What effect does the cost of O&M bear on this decision?	20	DOE-RFPO concurs with the comment in that less active management and maintenance of the system does not directly enhance ecological or environmental benefits. Not all Federal actions will result in benefit to ecological and environmental resources. The EA evaluates the potential impacts to these and other resources and determines the potential significance of proposed actions. §1.2 also states that the system "should preserve existing wetlands and habitat as available water allows."

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
11.	§1.2, Page 7, *Other activities have been identified that may have impacts to the environmental resources analyzed in this EA. These activities are primarily governed by CERCLA, and the required environmental analyses for these actions would be incorporated in RFCA decision documents and are outside the scope of this EA.*: The document doesn't address the issue of pond sediment remediation. Without the incorporation of an analysis of pond sediment remediation activities, the EA scope doesn't sufficiently analyze the potential impacts to habitat in the pond drainages (e.g. wetlands) and potential effects on the dam notching caused by removal of pond sediment. Again, this is another example of a piecemeal approach instead of a holistic approach. These activities and their environmental impacts should be integrated into the document evaluating the environmental analysis and impacts from these proposed activities. If these activities are not incorporated into this document, identify the document(s) that will include them.	8	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Scope of Analysis in Environmental Assessment.
12.	§1.3. Page 7, *The EA assesses potential impacts that the proposed actions would have on a future "baseline" configuration of the Site*: There is no discussion of what corrective action would be required if the assumed future "baseline" proves to be inaccurate. Revise the document to address how the "baseline" will be evaluated against future conditions and what corrective actions may be required.	22	The preliminary design of the system allows for flexibility in determining the storage capacity of each pond. The "baseline" configuration was based on the SWWB, which has an inherent level of uncertainty. The "baseline" will be evaluated against actual future conditions through routine operations of the ponds, and operational flexibility will be built into the design of the system.

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
13.	§2.0, Page 11, *In the interest of long-term stewardship of water resources at RFETS, DOE proposes modifying several dams in the North and South Walnut Creek drainages. The objectives for the modifications are to:* • *Create a pond and drainage system that requires less active management than the current system.* • *Preserve wetlands and habitat to the extent practicable, in a manner that is compliant with applicable regulations.* • *Modify the dams in a configuration that allows them to be reclassified from jurisdictional to non-jurisdictional dams under State Engineer's Office regulation, while simultaneously achieving the first two objectives.* Revise the document to justify why these objectives meet the need and interest of long- term stewardship. It seems that the proposed action is a method for saving on operational and maintenance expenses. Revise the document to briefly explain the difference between jurisdictional and non-jurisdictional dams and the basis for the decision to do this.	20	The objectives serve the interest of long-term Site stewardship by reducing the amount of effort and expense needed to maintain the Site following closure. The proposed action will accomplish this without adversely affecting the performance of the final remedy or the suitability of surrounding lands for use as a wildlife refuge. Specific parameters classify a dam as jurisdictional and require activities associated with dam monitoring, such as: vegetation mowing for inspections, piezometer reading and maintenance, and annual inspections by the State Engineer and FERC.
14.	§2.1.1, Page 12, *Ponds A-4 and B-5 would be maintained for two purposes.*: We expect that the post-RFCA shall include the pond configuration for the 12 drainage ponds at the site. We recognize that DOE and the regulators do not consider the ponds to be part of the remedy, but we also appreciate that they serve as a vital mechanism to prevent actinides from leaving the site. Revise the document to provide assurances the ponds will remain post-closure. Also revise the document to include language that the ponds will not revert to a natural system of passive flow. As long as there is a potential for actinide migration from residual contamination in the IA, the terminal ponds shall be managed as batch and release ponds.	5	§2.1.1 and §2.2.1 of the EA reflect that the ponds will "continue to be operated using the batch-release protocol that is currently employed to manage discharges."
15.	§2.1.3, Page 14, *The actual design for the dam modifications may vary, depending on the results of engineering analyses that are not within the scope of this EA.*: We disagree with the statement that the engineering analysis is not within the scope of the EA. The engineered analysis of the modified dams is part of holistically determining the remedy.	24	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Detailed Infrastructure and Operations.

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
16.	§2.1.3, Page 14, *The Pond A-2 average pool elevation was assumed to be lowered in the proposed action by approximately* 6 *feet. Maintaining a lower pool elevation would generally enhance dam safety, as well as satisfy requirements for reclassifying the pond as "non- jurisdictional" in accordance with the State Engineer's Office regulations*.: What is the basis for the assumption for lowering the pool elevation by six feet? Once again it appears this decision is based on dam reclassification and saving on operational and maintenance costs rather than allowing the pond to remain in its current configuration.	10	Please refer to Response to Groups of Similar Comments – Lowering of the A-2 Dam by 6 Feet.
17.	§2.1.3, Page 15, *Specific sections of the drainage channels...will require extra attention during the engineering design phase to address long-term channel erosion concerns.*: Revise the document to include the potential methods to reduce erosion in high erosion areas in the drainages. Floodplain management objectives are referred to, but are not identified in the document; revise the document to include what they are. We disagree with the statement in document that the engineering analysis for erosion controls is not within the scope of the EA. In order to holistically make an informed evaluation of the proposal, we need assurances erosion controls measures will be in place and adequate to protect surface water quality.	9	Erosion will be addressed in the design of the functional channels. Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Detailed Infrastructure and Operations.
18.	§2.1.3, Page 15, *Removed dam material may be reused onsite (as fill material)...or shipped off-site.*: We again reiterate that we are opposed to stockpiling contaminated soils in any area that is not contained or controlled. We also want to emphasize it is unacceptable to backfill with contaminated soils. The goal of remediation is to remove source material to protect human health and the environment. To dilute the material and land dispose it on the site in our view is not remediation or source reduction.	17	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Waste Characterization and Disposal.
19.	§2.1.4, Page 16, *While the need for long-term maintenance of the…but beyond the scope of this EA.*: The long-term operations and maintenance activities should be clearly identified in the document. Westminster is concerned that once again a proposal with such significant long-term stewardship implications does not contain long-term stewardship criteria within the proposed document. This is a piecemeal approach.	20, 24	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Detailed Infrastructure and Operations.

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
20.	§2.2, Page 17, We do not believe that this alternative has adequately addressed the effects of reduced capacity and retention ability for actinide settling.	25	Comment Noted. The terminal ponds serve as a safeguard for water quality and are not anticipated to be part of the final RFCA remedy.
21.	§2.3, Page 18, It is our understanding that the City and County of Broomfield prefers this alternative. We support their preference.	25	Comment Noted.
22.	§3.1.2, Page 21, *The excavated soils would be used to fill IA building basements or other low areas that exist after building removal.*: Some of these areas are part of an IHSS and characterization shall be performed to ensure the backfill material does not contain any residual contamination. (See our comment above relating to backfill material). It is also our understanding, that this area has a contaminated groundwater plume, will have a contaminated foundation left in place, and is in a high erosion area. We are concerned plans for this area includes natural drainage with a higher potential for erosion, which could through time erode into subsurface residual contamination. The final decision on backfilling the B371/374 basement, evaluating the groundwater plume impacts, and contouring the land in this area have not been provided to us and we are concerned an integrated evaluation has not been performed. Revise the document to include a conceptual map of the proposal for the B371/374 area and the proposed flow into Walnut Creek.	12, 17	The conceptual grading plan for the IA provided in the draft EA presents the grading at B371/374. Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Waste Characterization and Disposal.
23.	§3.1.4.1, Page 22, We have not seen the "IA Land Configuration Concept Design Grading Plan (Revision 1, March 2004) (K-H, 2004a)". Please provide us a copy in order to evaluate this section.	9	The referenced grading plan was included in the draft EA (Figure 3-1).
24.	§3.1.4.2, Page 22, *Many culverts and storm drains would be removed, and others would be plugged at both ends and remain in place.*: Revise the document to include the criteria to determine when culverts and storm drains will remain or be removed.	6	One culvert will remain in the drainage area between B371 and B771 because the removal of this culvert would destroy an area of well established environmental habitat. All other culverts will be removed or rendered ineffective by plugging, filling, or crushing.
25.	§3.1.4.3, Page 23, As stated above, we have not seen the "IA Land Configuration Concept Design Grading Plan (Revision 1, March 2004) (K-H, 2004a)". Revise the document to identify the location and number of channels needed (provide a map) and potential types of erosion controls that may be utilized.	9	The referenced grading plan was included in the draft EA (Figure 3-1).

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
26.	§3.1.4.4, Page 23, *Buildings 371/374, 776/777, 881, and 991 have specific grading plans as included in the IA Land Configuration Concept Design Grading Plan (Revision 1, March 2004) (K-H, 2004a). Discussions with CDPHE and DOE continue on these grading plans and could be slightly modified as a result of these discussions and limited groundwater/geotechnical/erosion evaluation at each of these building areas.*: Revise the document to identify the specific document that will capture the final decision and justification for the final grading.	9	A presentation of the grading plan at each of these major buildings should be included with the building specific DOPs.
27.	Figure 3.1, Page 27, The included map is useless. One cannot ascertain anything from what is provided. Add a larger, more readable map to the document.	25	Comment Noted.
28.	§4.2.1.2, Page 46, We know that SW093 has had some issues with elevated Pu-239/240, cadmium, and silver and the source of these elevated results have not been identified. We are disappointed that more aggressive measures have not been taken to determine the source of the contaminants. The potential for future elevated results to be above the RFCA limits may continue post-closure. Once again the document did not address the long-term stewardship obligations for monitoring at this location or identify contingencies in the event RFCA action levels are exceeded post-closure.	19, 20	Contaminant monitoring is within the purview of RFCA and is outside the scope of the EA. Monitoring requirements are described in the Integrated Monitoring Plan, and post-closure monitoring requirements are anticipated to be addressed in a Closure Integrated Monitoring Plan.
29.	§4.2.1.2, Page 48, We were recently told of another exceedance at GS10 with no real explanation as to why it occurred. We are still concerned with the periodical elevated levels at GS10. We are concerned the source material has not been identified which contributes to the elevated levels. Revise the document to include the required long-term stewardship activities associated with GS10 and the other POEs.	18	Contaminant monitoring is within the purview of RFCA and is outside the scope of the EA. Monitoring requirements are described in the Integrated Monitoring Plan, and post-closure monitoring requirements are anticipated to be addressed in a Closure Integrated Monitoring Plan.
30.	§4.3, Page 51, The analysis did not include the potential to encounter contamination during the proposed actions. Revise the document to include other health issues associated with potential contamination in these areas.	22	As noted in the EA, RFCA remedial activities in the area are assumed to have been completed prior to pond configuration activities. Thus, the soils in the area are not expected to contain contaminants in excess of RFCA allowed levels, and adverse impacts to human health are not anticipated.

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
31.	§5.1.1, Page 54, Why is water imported to Pond A-1 to keep its sediments wet? Is there uncertainty that there are contaminants in the pond and that the pond is wetted to prevent contaminants from going airborne?	19, 23	DOE-RFPO recognizes that low concentrations of contaminants are present in the sediments within Pond A-1, and the pond is wetted to prevent contaminants from becoming airborne. Whether remediation is necessary is outside the scope of the EA. Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Scope of Analysis in Environmental Assessment.
32.	Table 5-1, Page 72, One can ascertain from this table that the No Action Alternative is clearly the better of the options based on the comparisons.	25	Comment Noted.
June 11, 2004 Broomfield Letter			
1.	Broomfield believes the document is premature and fails to include any discussion or reference to the activities associated with the remediation of the contaminated sediments in the drainage ponds. We would like to thank the Site for meeting with us on several occasions to discuss the pond reconfiguration for the A-, B-, and C-series ponds; however, in spite of these meetings, we were unaware that the EA would also include proposals for the drainage and land configuration associated with Building 371/374 and the Industrial Area Land Configuration.	8	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Timing of Release of Environmental Assessment.
2.	Based on our previous meetings with the Site, Broomfield anticipated the details of the proposed plan would include characterization of the ponds and drainages, engineered designs, and modeling results. We do not want to impede the closure schedule, but the rush to have approved documents without, once again, evaluating a project holistically is disconcerting. Due to the significant impacts on long-term management and stewardship activities associated with the ponds post-closure, Broomfield believes the proposed EA document should include explicit information to enable us to make an informed decision.	20, 24	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Scope of Analysis in Environmental Assessment.

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
3.	Broomfield is concerned the EA does not address the A-, B-, and C-Series ponds and the Present Landfill pond as Individual Hazardous Substance Sites (IHSSs), nor does the EA contain information about the contamination in the drainages and the pond sediments. The ponds received treated and untreated process waste, untreated decontamination laundry wastewater, cooling tower blowdown, footing drain flows, water from an analytical laboratory, waste from radiography operations, untreated waste water from personnel decontamination rooms, and stormwater runoff; yet, the document does not address any contaminant information. If this is being handled in a separate CERCLA action, that document should be referenced.	22	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Scope of Analysis in Environmental Assessment and Exclusion of Non-Related Surface Water Structures.
4.	The EA should clearly identify the sampling methodologies for the drainage areas and the pond sediments. The sampling methodology should include both the potential and actual constituents of concern for the drainage system.	19	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Waste Characterization and Disposal.
5.	The EA should identify the remedial decisions for removing contaminants in the drainage system and the ponds. The public should have the opportunity to comment on the proposed remedial action, especially downgradient asset holders of water rights. Broomfield does not consider the removal of sediments to be a routine activity; therefore this activity should fall under the purview of a Proposed Action Memorandum (PAM) or an Interim Measure/Interim Remedial Action (IM/IRA).	8	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Scope of Analysis in Environmental Assessment.
6.	The EA should identify the potential for Points-of-Evaluation both up-stream and down-stream of the pond systems. We understand the document is an environmental assessment; however the drainage system and the ponds should be in the purview of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) and the Colorado Hazardous Waste Act based on historical records. We disagree with the statement in the document that the proposed activities in the EA do not fall within the scope of RFCA/CERCLA, and therefore require a separate environmental analysis.	7	POEs are located upstream of the ponds and POCs are located downstream of the ponds. Continued monitoring activities are under the purview of RFCA, and specific operations are documented in the Integrated Monitoring Plan. As the operation of the ponds is not anticipated to be part of the final remedy, actions impacting these structures are analyzed outside the purview of RFCA.

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
7.	The EA should address the sampling methodologies and proposed actions for the transfer lines from Building 774 and underneath Building 995. The line, which transferred process waste from B774 and discharged to Pond B-2 from an outlet below B995 until the early 1980s, has not been characterized. Revise the document to include the disposition of the line. If the line is to remain, the plan should address how the transfer line will be stabilized to prevent subsidence in the future.	19	Characterization and disposition of process waste lines is not within the scope of the EA. Analyses of actions related to process waste lines have been documented in RFCA decision documents (including the Environmental Restoration RSOP).
8.	The EA should clearly identify the sampling methodologies for the asphalt removal including both the potential and actual constituents of concern.	22	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Waste Characterization and Disposal.
9.	The EA should include the criteria for maintaining the drainage ditches next to the roads and the characterization of the soils. Specifically, how will the Site adhere to the final site land configuration plan to ensure erosion controls are in place to prevent migration of contaminants or incisions in areas with subsurface residual contamination?	9	Engineering controls to reduce erosion are planned on areas that are disturbed including the slopes of the functional channels and major building backfills during the regrading process. Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Waste Characterization and Disposal.
10.	The EA should include the basis for the proposed action for the drainage area west of B371/374. Once again, environmental impacts of contaminated groundwater plumes in the area should be integrated with other environmental media impacts. Provide the analysis of this area, especially the surface water erosion rates, predicted flow velocities, and the final topography in this area. The potential environmental impacts of diverting the groundwater around the B371 contaminated basement and regrading drainages to the west of B371 should be evaluated as a specific area of interest. The long-term stewardship obligations should be identified in the document to monitor and trend groundwater and surface water contaminant migration.	9, 19	The area west of B371/374 is being used as an on-site borrow area for clean soils to fill major building basements. There are no groundwater concerns in this area. In addition, the design of this functional channel will include the predicted channel flow velocities and erosion controls. Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Detailed Infrastructure and Operations.

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
11.	The alternative analysis assesses potential impacts of the proposed actions based on a *future baseline configuration* of the site. Water availability to North and South Walnut Creek will be reduced based on decommissioning the Waste Water Treatment Plant (WWTP), eliminating imported water to the site, and eliminating impervious surfaces (buildings and pavement) in the Industrial Area (IA). The plan does not identify a potential period for the site to reach equilibrium to evaluate the proposed alternatives. Based on the evaluation and analysis, is there a specified timeframe for the site to reach equilibrium?	4, 21	There is no specific time for the site to reach equilibrium. The water depletion issues and associated effects are beyond the scope of this EA. Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Scope of Analysis in Environmental Assessment.
12.	Environmental impacts associated with water depletion at the site are not addressed. The document states on Page 9, Paragraph 1, *Impacts associated with water depletion are outside the scope of the EA.* A comparison of WY2000 is provided, but it would also be helpful to compare the proposed future configuration to several wet and dry years.	2	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Scope of Analysis in Environmental Assessment.
13.	Based on the three purposes of the proposed modification, the plan should also identify how the system will require less active management than the current system. The plan should also include the cost of each management alternative.	25	Presently, movement and control of waters through the series of ponds requires significant management. The proposed action will convert the interior ponds to a flow-through system and will reduce management to discharges from the terminal ponds. Per DOE NEPA regulations, an EA is prepared to analyze the effects of Federal actions on human health and the environment. Cost estimates do not play a role in this evaluation, and their inclusion in the EA is not warranted.
14.	The alternative analysis to preserve wetlands and Preble's mouse habitat (PMJM) on Table 5-1 identifies the No Action Alternative as having no impact. Based on the analysis, it appears the No Action Alternative is the action with the least environmental impacts; yet, it is not the preferred alternative. Please explain.	4, 13	DOE-RFPO believes the proposed action is consistent with the desire for a post-closure drainage system that requires less active management and maintenance than the current system while preserving wetlands and habitat as available water allows.
15.	Table 5-1, Summary Comparison of Environmental Impacts: A and B Series Ponds should include a cost analysis for each alternative and should include the Present Landfill pond, SID, and the C series ponds.	22, 25	Per DOE NEPA regulations, an EA is prepared to analyze the effects of Federal actions on human health and the environment. Cost estimates do not play a role in this evaluation, and their inclusion in the EA is not warranted. Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Non-Related Surface Water Structures.

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
16.	Table 5-1, Summary Comparison of Environmental Impacts: A and B Series Ponds should include a short-term and long-term analysis of the proposed alternative and the other alternatives. The Present Landfill Pond, SID, and the C-Series Ponds should be added to the alternative analysis.	22	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Non-Related Surface Water Structures.
17.	The requirements for a jurisdictional dam and associated operational costs should be included in the alternative analysis. In addition, the requirements and associated operating, surveillance, and maintenance costs for non-jurisdictional dams should be included in the EA.	10	Per DOE NEPA regulations, an EA is prepared to analyze the effects of Federal actions on human health and the environment. Cost estimates do not play a role in this evaluation, and their inclusion in the EA is not warranted.
18.	The draft proposed action alternative states *a "notch" will be cut into each dam to reduce its effective height (Figure 2-2), thus creating a lower-profile.* Provide Broomfield with the process to disposition the removed soil from the dam and the characterization plan for the media.	17	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Waste Characterization and Disposal.
19.	The asphalt roads will be removed; yet the document does not state the disposition of the asphalt. Provide us with the criteria to determine the disposition of the asphalt. Broomfield prefers to have the asphalt recycled if it meets the free-release criteria. If the material is not free-released, it should be managed as waste and shipped off-site.	22	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Waste Characterization and Disposal.
20.	The document addresses the configuration of the IA, yet it does not clarify the process to disposition the soils being removed. Broomfield does not expect to have any contaminated soils used as backfill on the site. Clarify the sampling process and evaluation process to determine if excavated soil can be used as backfill. Broomfield was not in agreement with the revised Rocky Flats Clean-up Agreements (RFCA) that contaminated soils could be used as backfill on the site.	17, 19	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Waste Characterization and Disposal.
21.	The document does not address the sediment removal of the ponds. Broomfield once again requests the EA draft document be incorporated into a PAM or an IM/IRA to evaluate all the environmental impacts of any activity associated with the ponds and their final post-closure operations and surveillance.	8	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Scope of Analysis in Environmental Assessment.

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
22.	The draft proposed action alternative states a *"notch" will be cut into each dam to reduce its effective height (Figure 2-2), thus creating a lower-profile.* We understand the design is conceptual at this stage and the invert elevation of the notch would be the same as the pond bottom elevation. We also understand the actual design for the dam modifications may vary, depending on the results of engineering analysis. The EA states the engineering analysis is not with the scope of the EA, yet it is a crucial aspect of the proposal. Provide Broomfield with the objectives for the engineering analyses. Also identify the document that will contain the engineering analysis.	10, 24	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Detailed Infrastructure and Operations.
23.	Clarify why A-2 was assumed to be lowered in the proposed action by approximately 6 feet. Also justify why Pond A-2 is the exception other than trying to meet the State Engineer's Office regulation criteria for pool elevation and dam safety.	10	Please refer to Response to Groups of Similar Comments – Lowering of the A-2 Dam by 6 Feet.
24.	The document states *the notch, the downstream slope of the dam below the notch, and a section of channel below the dam would be armored to provide erosion protection.* Clarify if the armored material is concrete, rip/rap, or a combination of the two materials. Therefore, this proposed alternative does not appear to be conducive to ecological habitats, nor to a natural setting of a Wildlife Refuge compared to the existing system. A readable map should be included in the document for the proposed land configuration in the B371/374 area that also captures the design of the natural drainage from the south to the west and downgradient into Walnut Creek.	10, 24	The specific system design will be completed as part of an engineering analysis to be performed prior to construction. Erosion controls will be minimized to the extent practicable, but will be required to prevent erosion within the drainage. Larger, more readable land configuration maps are available from DOE-RFPO. Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Detailed Infrastructure and Operations.
25.	The flow design and modeling analysis for the reconfigured B371/374 area should also be included in the document. Clarify if there will be any barriers in the design to reduce flow velocity, reduce erosion, and/or control the discharge into Walnut Creek via culverts.	9	The specific design of the functional channels is not within the scope of the EA. Engineering controls to reduce erosion are planned on areas that are disturbed including the slopes of the functional channels and major building backfills during the regrading process. Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Detailed Infrastructure and Operations.
26.	Broomfield is concerned the final land configuration document has not been drafted and finalized to provide elevation criteria for the final land configuration in the IA. If roads are removed, what will be the criteria to control sheet flow into the drainages?	9	Ditches along the roadways and parking areas will be evaluated as each road or parking area is removed. Ditches will be removed, remain, or be re-configured as swales as determined in the specific grading of an area.

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
27.	To enlarge the pipelines or modify the concrete diversion walls to continue the bypass of the A-1 and B-1 ponds to protect water quality during the construction to reconfigure the ponds suggests the current system is not sufficient to handle current flows in this area. Provide Broomfield with the proposed plans to enhance the system such as flow capacity, size of pipes, and reconfiguration of the concrete walls.	24	DOE-RFPO believes that this comment relates to the description of an alternative not evaluated in the EA (§2.4). The modification to by-pass piping is not planned.
28.	If the reconfigured system is temporary, provide us with the approximate cost of the reconfiguration of the bypass structures.	25	Per DOE NEPA regulations, an EA is prepared to analyze the effects of Federal actions on human health and the environment. Cost estimates do not play a role in this evaluation, and their inclusion in the EA is not warranted.
29.	Provide the criteria to determine when the bypass structures should be removed.	24	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Detailed Infrastructure and Operations.
30.	Clarify how the debris material generated from removal of the bypass structures will be dispositioned post-closure.	17	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Waste Characterization and Disposal.
31.	We agree diverting flow around the ponds will allow vegetation to become re-established without being washed out, thereby reducing erosion in disturbed areas. Revise the document to include the criteria to determine when the vegetation has been established and allowed to mature. Include the responsible party to determine if the vegetation has been re-established and when the bypass structures should be removed.	4, 24	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Detailed Infrastructure and Operations.
32.	Revise the document to include the estimated timeline to reconfigure the ponds.	24	A specific timeline to complete the actions was not determined due to a number of variable factors (including climate and completion of RFCA remedial actions). For estimation purposes, the expected time to complete modifications of each individual dam is approximately three weeks.
33.	Revise the document to include the estimated timeline for the vegetation to mature.	4	There is no specific time for the site to reach equilibrium. Numerous unpredictable factors (including precipitation, climate, etc.) do not allow for a prediction to be made.
34.	Revise the document to include the relative maintenance of the bypass structures and associated operating portions of the systems such as valve gates, outlet works, or channels and the associated costs.	24	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Detailed Infrastructure and Operations.

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
35.	Revise the document to include the relative maintenance of the reconfigured ponds such as stop gates, outlet works, drainage channels and associated costs of the Operations and Maintenance (O&M). Broomfield believes this information is within the scope of the document. Information relative to O&M and long-term stewardship obligations will help us evaluate all the proposed alternatives.	20, 24	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Detailed Infrastructure and Operations.
36.	The current culverts are 12-inch diameter corrugated metal pipes. Provide Broomfield with the proposed culvert design and flow capacity.	6	The specific system design is outside the scope of the EA. Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Detailed Infrastructure and Operations.
37.	Clarify if the current piping associated with the culverts will be removed or left in place. If the piping is left in place, will the piping be capped or grouted? Broomfield is concerned miles of remaining pipelines post-closure could be potential pathways for contaminant migration or increased erosion and subsidence.	6	One active culvert will remain in the drainage area between B371 and B771 because the removal of this culvert would destroy an area of well established environmental habitat. All other culverts will be removed or rendered ineffective by plugging, filling, or crushing.
38.	Once the re-configured bypass system is no longer needed, how will the expanded system be dispositioned?	17	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Waste Characterization and Disposal.
39.	Section 3.1.4.2, Culverts and Storm Drains, states *many culverts and storm drains would be removed and others would be plugged at both ends and remain in place.* Revise the document to include the criteria to determine when culverts and storm drains will be removed or remain in place. Broomfield is concerned the remaining culverts or storm drains will be prone to subsidence if only the ends of the structures are capped. The culverts and storm drains are in areas of high erosion and could eventually be exposed.	6	Recent discussions between the DOE, K-H, EPA and CDPHE have identified only a few culverts that will remain in the IA and that will need to be addressed during RFETS closure. Each remaining, inactive culvert will be reviewed to determine the best approach; either plugging the entire length, filling the ends or crushing the culvert in-place are some of the options under consideration.
40.	Revise the document to include a map of the current culverts and storm drains and identify which structures will remain. Provide justification for the decision-making process.	6	See response to comments 37 and 39 (above).
41.	Revise the document to include the Surveillance and Maintenance (S&M) of the remaining structures. The S&M should become part of the long-terms stewardship obligations by DOE.	20, 24	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Detailed Infrastructure and Operations.

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
42.	Revise the document to include the criteria to provide erosion protection in newly constructed channels in the IA. The document states *erosion protection would be provided at the bottom and side of the channels as needed and covered with soil.* Clarify if the controls will be drop structures, rip/rap, mats, or concrete barriers.	9	Specific erosion controls will be addressed in the design of the functional channels. Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Detailed Infrastructure and Operations.
43.	Revise the document to state the channels will be re-vegetated to control erosion. Include the S&M of the channels both short-term and long-term.	4, 9	Specific erosion controls will be addressed in the design of the functional channels. Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Detailed Infrastructure and Operations.
44.	Revise the document to include other potential methods to reduce velocity flow other than grades in the channel.	9	Specific erosion controls will be addressed in the design of the functional channels. Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Detailed Infrastructure and Operations.
45.	The document states discussions with the Colorado Department of Public Health and the Environment (CDPHE) and DOE are taking place for specific grading areas. The specific grading plans discussed were for B371/374, B776/777, B881, and B991. The document does not provided any details of the discussions or the criteria for the final grading plans. Provide Broomfield with a copy of the IA Land Configuration Concept Design Grading Plan (Revision 1, March 2004) (K-H, 2004a). We are concerned the B991 project has almost been completed and the B881 project is near completion. The grading plans and drainage channels in the areas have not been clearly identified. It is disconcerting that some of the crucial decisions may be made based on field activities rather than on groundwater/geotechnical/erosion evaluations for the specific area. These decisions are crucial to the final site-wide surface water drainage on-site and off-site. With remaining subsurface contamination in the IA, it is imperative the final land configuration of the site and surface water flows be protective of the residual contamination and prevent contaminant migration both on-site and off-site.	9	A presentation of the grading plan at each of these major buildings should be included with the building specific Decommissioning Operations Plans and have included an evaluation of groundwater and surface water interactions as well as geotechnical considerations.
46.	The City & County of Broomfield is very concerned the document did not include the C-Series ponds, Present Landfill Pond and the South Interceptor Ditch (SID). Provide justification as to why DOE did not include C-1 and C-2 ponds and the SID.	1	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Non-Related Surface Water Structures.

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
47.	We understand there may be uncertainties associated with the Original Landfill and the buried waste in the Ash Pits. Broomfield is concerned both of these areas are within the Woman Creek drainage. Broomfield is not certain of the contamination levels in the Woman Creek drainage. The RFCA action levels for Pu and Am may not be sufficient to protect surface water quality in this area. Solvents, heavy metals, and radionuclides will remain in the soil in this area. It is imperative the ponds remain. C-2 should remain as a batch and release pond to allow for settlement of actinides. The C-series ponds are a last measure of protection for the downstream community. The retention pond provides an additional layer of protection for surface water quality before it leaves the site.	1	Comment Noted. Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Non-Related Surface Water Structures.
48.	Revise the document to include the C-series ponds, Present Landfill pond, and the SID along with the proposed alternative analysis for the SID and the ponds entering Woman Creek.	1	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Non-Related Surface Water Structures.
49.	All drainages discharging off-site should be included in the document to evaluate the site as a whole. Both Broomfield and Westminster, as asset holders, have been continually involved with decisions impacting surface water quality both on-site and off-site. Broomfield is disappointed that DOE did not include such a germane topic in the EA Pond and Land Configuration document. We consider the C-series ponds and the Present Landfill Pond to be a vital element of the pond drainage systems at Rocky Flats and both local governments share mutual concerns and goals to protect surface water quality.	1	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Non-Related Surface Water Structures.
50.	The document should also be revised to address the SID and any potential plans to restructure the SID.	1	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Non-Related Surface Water Structures.
51.	The document should evaluate the drainage systems holistically, thereby allowing the long-term stewardship obligations to reflect the same criteria to protect surface water quality leaving the site.	1	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Non-Related Surface Water Structures.
52.	The City & County of Broomfield has voiced and documented in previous letters its concerns that the Present Landfill pond waters/leachate continue to be transferred to the A-series ponds. Revise the document to include the Present Landfill Pond and the disposition of the retained waters from the pond.	21	The East Landfill pond is not covered under this EA. As stated in the Present Landfill IM/IRA, once the modified treatment system is in place, the East Landfill Pond water will not be transferred to the A-series ponds.

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
53.	The pond water is transferred once or twice a year to the A-series ponds, and we do not understand the resistance to continue this operating process. To transfer the water to the A-series drainage system provides a protective layering system for both surface water and groundwater in this area.	21	This comment is beyond the scope of the EA. However, the treatment of the Present Landfill seep will continue after the construction of the accelerated action, and will continue to be monitored to meet the surface water action levels identified in RFCA. Therefore the surface water in the East Landfill Pond will also meet the surface water action level and the transfer of water to the A-series ponds will not be necessary. As stated in the Present Landfill IM/IRA, once the modified treatment system is in place, the East Landfill Pond water will not be transferred to the A-series ponds.
54.	The document initially identifies 12 ponds in the drainage system, and Broomfield believes the document should address all 12 ponds along with the long-term configuration of the drainage system at the site.	22	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Non-Related Surface Water Structures.
55.	Broomfield disagrees with the statement that the ancillary closure activities other than the scope of the EA are outside the scope of the document. Removal of the sediments, dam material, asphalt and roads, and soils generated from drainage and culvert configurations all have the potential to encounter contamination. The document only addresses an affected environment based on assumptions that construction will be in clean areas.	17, 22	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Scope of Analysis in Environmental Assessment and Waste Characterization and Disposal.
56.	Revise the document to evaluate potential affects to the environment based on the possibility contamination will be encountered. The air quality analysis should be revised to include other pollutants than the identified total suspended particulate matter (TSP), PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$.	23	As noted in the EA, RFCA remedial activities in the area are assumed to have been completed prior to pond configuration activities. Thus, the soils in the area are not expected to contain contaminants in excess of RFCA allowed levels.
57.	Broomfield appreciates the details of Tables 4-1 and 4-2. The details of the current wetland conditions and post-closure conditions were very useful.	25	Comment Noted.

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
58.	Broomfield is still concerned with the surface water quality at GS10 draining into the South Walnut Creek ponds. Silver, plutonium (Pu), and americium (Am) have periodically measured above the RFCA action levels and the source has still not been identified. As recent as June 3, 2004, GS10 has had levels that have exceeded the RFCA levels. The document assumes the water quality will be generally of comparable quality or possibly improved based on significant reduction in peak flow rates and total run-off volume from storm events, as well as erosion. The erosion rates should reduce the potential for residual contaminants in the surface soil to be mobilized, specifically Pu and Am. The erosion rates will be reduced based on the site-wide water balance study, but the contamination, if not remediated, may become concentrated in these areas and when mobilized may lead to water quality degradation with higher concentrations.	18	DOE-RFPO concurs with the comment. However, the A-series and B-series ponds are operated as safeguard to water quality and are not anticipated to be part of the final RFCA remedy. Contamination monitoring is under the purview of RFCA, and monitoring operations are documented in the Integrated Monitoring Plan.
59.	Broomfield expects the post-RFCA to include the pond configuration for the 12 drainage ponds at the site. We understand DOE and the regulators do not consider the ponds to be part of the remedy, but they serve as a vital mechanism to prevent actinides from leaving the Rocky Flats site.	25	Comment Noted.
60.	Revise the document to provide assurances the ponds will remain post-closure. Also include language to keep downstream asset holders apprised of any activities associated with the Operations and Monitoring (O&M) and S&M of the ponds and drainage systems.	20	§2.1.1 and §2.2.1 of the EA reflect that the ponds will "continue to be operated using the batch-release protocol that is currently employed to manage discharges." Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Detailed Infrastructure and Operations.
61.	Broomfield has continually voiced our opinion of the importance of the ponds and their purpose as a last measure of protection to our community to protect surface water quality. We ask to be kept apprised of any future activities associated with the Walnut Creek drainage during this transition period and post-closure.	25	Comment Noted.
62.	We also ask that the remediation of the sediments, contaminants in the drainages, and land configuration decisions be available to Broomfield for their review and recommendations.	25	These decisions have been and are being made available through public review of this EA and RFCA decision documents. Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Scope of Analysis in Environmental Assessment.

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
63.	Broomfield especially wants the document to be revised to include language that the ponds will not revert to a natural system of passive flow. As long as there is a potential for actinide migration from residual contamination in the IA, the terminal ponds shall be managed as batch and release ponds.	22	§2.1.1 and §2.2.1 of the EA reflect that the ponds will "continue to be operated using the batch-release protocol that is currently employed to manage discharges."
64.	We would like to thank the Site for meeting with us on several occasions to discuss the proposed reconfiguration. We wish to continue the dialogue for a topic that is one of our top priorities.	25	Comment Noted.
65.	With the WWTP being decommissioned, a NPDES will no longer be required for the WWTP. The EA does not discuss a revision to the NDPES permit. Revise the document to address the NPDES status of discharging to waters of the state.	2	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Scope of Analysis in Environmental Assessment.
66.	Based on the proposed final land configuration drainage, will there be any new point-source or non-point discharges to Walnut Creek or Woman Creek?	9	There will not be any new point source or non-point source discharges to Walnut Creek or Woman Creek.
67.	Broomfield is concerned it took the Site several years to get the last NPDES permit approved. We are concerned there may not be an approved revised NPDES permit at closure. Provide Broomfield with the status of the permit and if DOE intends to amend the permit to meet post-closure requirements.	20	An approved revised NPDES permit at closure will not be required. The last remaining permitted outfall will be removed, and the remainder of the permit (a Phase I Individual Storm Water Permit for a Site with Industrial Activities) will be obsolete. The only potential future permit that may be required would be a General Storm Water Permit for Construction Activities if such activities were to disturb an area greater than one acre. Such activities are outside the scope of the EA.
68.	Broomfield is concerned the document does not clearly identify the long-term stewardship criteria that is needed to adequately maintain the pond drainage system post-closure.	20	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Detailed Infrastructure and Operations.
69.	Revise the document to include the surveillance criteria for the drainage system post-closure.	20	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Detailed Infrastructure and Operations.
70.	Revise the document to include the criteria for releasing water through the stop-gates.	24	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Detailed Infrastructure and Operations.

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
71.	Revise the document to include the criteria to remove the bypass structures, disposition of the wasted bypass structures, and alternative analysis identifying the preferred action to remove the bypass system.	24	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Detailed Infrastructure and Operations and Waste Characterization and Disposal.
72.	Broomfield prefers the bypass system remain in place for at least two CERCLA review periods to allow for an adequate evaluation of the site hydrology and drainage systems. In the event DOE decides to remove the bypass systems, an alternative spill prevention and contaminant controls plan should be in place to protect downstream communities.	25	Comment Noted.
73.	Page 1, §1.1.1, Site Description, Paragraph 2: The document states *the ponds are identified as IHSSs in Attachment 3 of RFCA and all appropriate analysis and any necessary response actions will be taken pursuant to RFCA. However, the activities proposed in this EA do not fall within the scope of RFCA/CERCLA, and therefore require separate environmental analysis*. Broomfield disagrees that the two activities should be analyzed separately. Without knowing what response actions will be taken pursuant to RFCA, the environmental analysis for the EA proposals may still encounter contamination and the scope of the EA document's analysis would be deficient.	8	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Scope of Analysis in Environmental Assessment.
74.	Page 2, §1.1.2, North and South Walnut Creek Retention Ponds, Paragraph 1: The document identifies twelve retention ponds in multiple drainages, but only addresses nine ponds located in North and South Walnut Creeks. The document does not provide any justification for not including all twelve ponds in the environmental assessment. Revise the document to include the other ponds or provide the justification for not including them in the EA.	1	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Non-Related Surface Water Structures. §1.1.2 has been revised to clarify the issue.

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
75.	Page 5, §1.1.2, North and South Walnut Creek Retention Ponds – Other Drainage Features, Paragraph 1: The EA states a buried pipeline exists to allow pumping of water between drainages from B-2 to A-2. Broomfield is concerned with the contamination levels of this pipeline due to the nature of waste that was transferred between the two ponds. We are also concerned with the methodology to either remove the lines or allow them to remain in place. Revise the document to include the disposition of the buried pipeline. It may be practical to maintain this pipeline in the event water needs to be transferred either as a spill prevention measure or as a diverting measure if contamination is encountered. If the pipeline does remain in place, revise the document to include the long-term stewardship surveillance and monitoring (S&M).	24	Surface piping and piping buried less than three feet below final grade will be removed. However, some piping between the A-series and B-series ponds will remain for a period of time after site closure for the management of surface water.
76.	Page 5, §1.1.2, North and South Walnut Creek Retention Ponds – Other Drainage Features, Paragraph 1: Other above ground pipelines exists between Ponds B-3 and A-3 and between Ponds B-5 and A-4. Revise the document to include the post-closure status of these lines. It may be beneficial to maintain these lines in the event water needs to be transferred either as a spill prevention measure or as a diverting measure in the event contamination is encountered.	24	Surface piping and piping buried less than three feet below final grade will be removed. However, some piping between the A-series and B-series ponds will remain for a period of time after site closure for the management of surface water.
77.	Page 6, §1.2, Purpose and Need for Action, Paragraph 1: To accomplish the long-term responsibility for DOE to manage the drainage systems, a *less active management and maintenance system than the current system should be required*. Provide the basis for this statement. Provide justification that a less active management and maintenance system will enhance ecological or environmental aspects of the drainage system.	22	DOE-RFPO concurs with the comment in that less active management and maintenance of the system does not directly enhance ecological or environmental benefits. Not all Federal actions will result in benefit to ecological and environmental resources. The EA evaluates the potential impacts to these and other resources and determines the potential significance of proposed actions. §1.2 also states that the system "should preserve existing wetlands and habitat as available water allows."

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
78.	Page 7, §1.2, Purpose and Need for Action, Paragraph 2: Other activities associated with the ponds are removal of sediments within the ponds if action levels are exceeded and an analysis of depletion of available water to North and South Walnut Creek Drainages. These activities and their environmental impacts should be integrated into one document evaluating the environmental analysis and impacts from DOE's proposed activities. If these activities are not incorporated into one document, identify the document that will include the sediment removal activity and the analysis and impacts of the depletion of water entering the Walnut Creek drainages.	8	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Scope of Analysis in Environmental Assessment.
79.	Page 7, §1.3, EA Baseline Configuration – A and B Series Ponds, Paragraph 1: The EA assesses potential impacts of the proposed action *on a future "baseline" configuration of the site.* The plan does not address any corrective measure that may be required in the event the baseline is not accurate. Revise the document to include surveillance measures to evaluate the baseline post-closure. Also include any assessment objectives to determine the adequacy of the baseline and any proposed actions to ensure surface water quality is not jeopardized. In the event the baseline is incorrect pertaining to the volume of surface water entering Walnut Creek, how will the requirements for the 100-year floodplain be met?	22	The preliminary design of the system allows for flexibility in determining the storage capacity of each pond. The "baseline" configuration was based on the SWWB, which has an inherent level of uncertainty. The "baseline" will be evaluated against actual future conditions through routine operations of the ponds, and operational flexibility will be built into the design of the system. Water quality monitoring is under the purview of RFCA, and monitoring procedures are documented in the Integrated Monitoring Plan. The terminal ponds will remain to provide a safeguard for water quality. With respect to the quantity of water entering the drainages, water reductions will be realized in any scenario. The capacity of terminal ponds A-4 and B-5 are more than adequately sized to accommodate the remaining water and a 100-year 6-hour storm event.

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
80.	Page 11, §2.0, Range of Alternatives For A and B Series Ponds, Paragraph 1: In the interest of long-term stewardship of water resources at Rocky Flats, DOE proposed to modify several dams in the North and South Walnut Creek drainages. The objectives for the modifications are to • *Create a pond and drainage system that requires less active management than the current system.* • *Preserve wetlands and habitat to the extent practicable, in a manner that is compliant with applicable regulations.* • *Modify the dams in a configuration that allow them to be reclassified from jurisdictional to non-jurisdictional dams under State Engineer's Office regulation, while simultaneously achieving the first tow objectives.* Provide the justification for the objectives to meet the need and interest of long-term stewardship. Revise the document to briefly explain the different criteria for jurisdictional and non-jurisdictional dams. If one of the objectives is to preserve wetland and habitat to the extent practicable, is the objective based on reduced water flow or the proposed reconfiguration of the ponds?	10, 20, 22	The objectives serve the interest of long-term Site stewardship by reducing the amount of effort and expense needed to maintain the Site following closure. The proposed action will accomplish this without adversely affecting the performance of the final remedy or the suitability of surrounding lands for use as a wildlife refuge. Specific parameters classify a dam as jurisdictional and require activities associated with dam monitoring, such as: vegetation mowing for inspections, piezometer reading and maintenance, and annual inspections by the State Engineer and FERC. The objective to preserve wetland and habitat to the extent practicable is based on both reduced water flow (the "baseline") and the subsequent configuration of the ponds.
81.	Page 12, §2.1.1, Maintain Existing Configuration – Terminal Ponds A-4 and B-5, Paragraph 2: It is imperative to revise the document to state the terminal ponds and the other network of drainage ponds will remain post-closure. The City & County of Broomfield wants to ensure the longest residence times are available to provide improved water quality in the existing pond network for water leaving the site. We also want assurances the ponds will be kept and maintained to guarantee flood measures and controls are in place to prevent flood hazards downstream.	22	§2.1.1 and §2.2.1 of the EA reflect that the ponds will "continue to be operated using the batch-release protocol that is currently employed to manage discharges."
82.	Page 13, §2.1.2, Maintain Existing Configuration – Pond A-3, Paragraph 1: The EA predicts the current number of discharges of four to seven per year will be reduced to three discharges per year. Will the criteria for discharging from A-3 to A-4 remain the same? Provide the O&M general activities for the revised pond management operations.	24	The criteria for discharging water from pond A-3 to pond A-4 will remain consistent with current operating practices. Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Detailed Infrastructure and Operations.

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
83.	Page 14, §2.1.3, Modify Interior Ponds – A-1, A-2, B-1, B-2, B-3, B-4, Paragraph 2: We understand the typical front view of the modified dam is appropriated for this level of document. However, the actual design for the dam modification may vary, depending on the results of engineering analysis. We disagree with the statement that the engineering analysis is not within the scope of the EA. The engineered analysis of the modified dams is germane to capacity and flow of the drainages in Walnut Creek. Provide a brief summary of the data the engineer will use to evaluate the engineered design for each pond. If the baseline is incorrect, what are the potential ramifications for the communities downstream of the Walnut Creek drainages?	10	The engineering analysis will likely be an iterative process whereby a range of flow rates are modeled through the drainage system and dam specifications are adjusted accordingly. The analysis will also consider adequate flood storage capacity and flexibility in operations for low-flow conditions. Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Detailed Infrastructure and Operations.
84.	Page 14, §2.1.3, Modify Interior Ponds – A-1, A-2, B-1, B-2, B-3, B-4, Paragraph 3: Provide the rationale for lowering the pool elevation in A-2 by approximately six feet. Once again it appears this decision is based on dam reclassification rather than allowing the pond to remain in its current configuration. The objective for the decision should not solely be based on operational costs, but rather on environmental and ecological impacts.	10	Please refer to Response to Groups of Similar Comments – Lowering of the A-2 Dam by 6 Feet.
85.	Page 15, §2.1.3, Modify Interior Ponds – A-1, A-2, B-1, B-2, B-3, B-4, Paragraph 2: The drainage channels have existing areas with high erosion rates, such as below B-4, and will require additional attention during the engineering design phase to address the long-term erosion concerns. Revise the document to include the potential methods to reduce erosion in high erosion areas in the drainages. Floodplain management objectives are referred to, but are not identified in the document. Broomfield disagrees with the statement in document that the engineering analysis for erosion controls are not within the scope of the EA. To make an informed evaluation of the proposal, we need assurances erosion controls measures will be in place and adequate to protect surface water quality.	10	Erosion controls will be factored into the specific design of the drainage system. Erosion controls will be minimized to the extent practicable to avoid significant impacts to sensitive habitat. However, in some areas, substantial erosion control may be necessary. Specific analyses of erosion control type and placement are outside the scope of the EA. Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Detailed Infrastructure and Operations.

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
86.	Page 15, §2.1.3, Modify Interior Ponds – A-1, A-2, B-1, B-2, B-3, B-4, Paragraph 3: *Removed dam material may be reused onsite as fill material or shipped off-site.* Broomfield once again wants to state any contaminated soils shall be shipped off-site and not used as fill material on-site. Broomfield does not expect soils with residual contamination to be buried on-site or placed in areas of high erosion.	17, 19	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Waste Characterization and Disposal.
87.	Page 15, §2.1.4, Temporarily Maintain Existing Configuration –Bypass Structures, Paragraph 1: Revise the document to include the criteria to determine when the bypass structures will no longer be needed. Broomfield believes the structures should remain in place for spill control in the event water levels need to be maintained and in the event water quality is in question and water needs to be diverted.	24	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Detailed Infrastructure and Operations.
88.	Page 16, §2.1.4, Temporarily Maintain Existing Configuration –Bypass Structures, Paragraph 4: The bypass structures will require long-term S&M and these activities should be clearly identified in the document. Broomfield is concerned that once again a proposal with such significant long-term stewardship implications does not contain long-term stewardship criteria within the proposed document. What assurances do we have O&M and S&M will be requirements for the drainage systems post-closure?	20	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Detailed Infrastructure and Operations.
89.	Page 17, §2.2, Alternative Action – A and B Series Ponds: Broomfield does approve of this alternative based on the reduced capacity and retention ability for actinides. This alternative would also require more frequent discharges and additional sampling.	25	Comment Noted. DOE-RFPO disagrees with the comment as the proposed action is consistent with the desire for a post-closure drainage system that requires less active management and maintenance than the current system while preserving wetlands and habitat as available water allows.
90.	Page 18, §2.3, No Action Alternative – A and B Series Ponds: Broomfield still prefers the No Action Alternative but is amenable to the preferred alternative with assurances of O&M and S&M post-closure. A commitment to retain the ponds in the preferred proposed configuration should also be included in the Post-RFCA language.	20, 25	Comment Noted. DOE-RFPO disagrees with the comment as the proposed action is consistent with the desire for a post-closure drainage system that requires less active management and maintenance than the current system while preserving wetlands and habitat as available water allows.

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
91.	Page 21, §3.1.1, Proposed Action – Other Non-CERCLA Actions, Paragraph 1: The EA states asphalt will be removed from major roads and parking lots. Revise the document to include the locations of the parking lots either in the text or on a map. Broomfield is concerned some of the roads or parking lots are within an IHSS and the environmental assessment does not address any contaminants.	17, 19	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Waste Characterization and Disposal.
92.	Page 21, §3.1.1, Proposed Action – Other Non-CERCLA Actions, Paragraph 1: The EA states: *Generally, roads would not be graded to remove drainage ditches along the roadway. Limited grading would be conducted as needed to promote overland flow of stormwater*. Provide the decision making process to determine if grading will or will not be required. If the drainage ditches along the roads are retained, will they require S&M post-closure to ensure stormwater is adequately flowing into the drainage system?	9	Ditches along the roadways and parking areas will be evaluated as each road or parking area is removed. Ditches will be removed, remain, or be re-configured as swales as determined in the specific grading of an area.
93.	Page 21, §3.1.2, Drainage Area West of Building 371/374, Paragraph 1: The soils excavated to establish drainage for the area south and west of Building 371/374 *will be used to fill IA building basements or other low areas that exist after building removal*. Some of these areas are part of an IHSS and characterization should be performed to ensure the backfill material does not contain any residual contamination. Broomfield is concerned this area has a contaminated groundwater plume, will have a contaminated foundation, and is in a high erosion area. We are concerned plans for this area include natural drainage with a higher potential for erosion, which could through time erode into subsurface residual contamination. The final decision on backfilling the B371/374 basement, evaluating the groundwater plume impacts, and contouring the land in this area have not been provided to us and we are concerned an integrated evaluation has not been performed. The environmental impacts have not been addressed in the document. The document does not address the culverts downstream or the point of entry into Walnut Creek. Revise the document to include a conceptual map of the proposal for the B371/374 area and the proposed flow into Walnut Creek. Broomfield would like to review the map and identify the current groundwater wells and surface water sampling locations in this area.	9, 17, 19	The area west of B371/374 is being used as an on-site borrow area for clean soils to fill major building basements. There are no groundwater concerns in this area. In addition, the design of this functional channel will include the predicted channel flow velocities and erosion controls. Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Waste Characterization and Disposal.

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
94.	Page 22, §3.1.3, Industrial Area Configuration, Paragraph 1: The draft EA document states the general concept for the IA Land Configuration is to provide a land surface consistent with the end use of the facility as a wildlife refuge. One of the goals of the IA Land Configuration is *to limit erosion, specifically in the drainage ditches*. Broomfield believes an additional goal for the IA Land Configuration Plan should be to limit erosion in all areas with the potential to impact surface water. Provide Broomfield with a copy of the IA Land Configuration Concept Design Grading Plan (Revision 1, March 2004) (K-H, 2004a). Has modeling been performed to address the sheetflow on the north and south side of Central Avenue? Will this area have to be regraded or will the ditches remain?	9	Engineering controls to reduce erosion are planned on areas that are disturbed including the slopes of the functional channels and major building backfills during the regrading process. The need to retain ditches along the roadways will be evaluated as each road is removed.
95.	Page 22, §3.1.4.2, Culverts and Storm Drains, Paragraph 1: Per the EA: *Many culverts and storm drains would be removed, and others would be plugged at both ends and remain in place.* Provide the criteria to determine when culverts and storm drains will remain or be removed. Provide the justification for removing the culverts. Broomfield is concerned the culverts east of B991 and near B771 will be removed and we are not aware of the alternatives. These areas are prone to high erosion, and we want to ensure surface water quality entering the A and B-Series ponds does not contain high levels of total suspended solids and/or actinides. If the culverts in the B771 area and B991 area are to removed, provide us with the details of the proposed action.	6	Recent discussions between the DOE, K-H, EPA and CDPHE have identified only a few culverts that will remain in the IA and that will need to be addressed during RFETS closure. Each remaining, inactive culvert will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis to determine the best approach; either plugging the entire length, filling the ends or crushing the culvert in-place are some of the options under consideration. The detailed design of the functional channels is not within the scope of the EA; however, each functional channel will use engineering controls to reduce erosion.
96.	Page 23, §3.1.4.3, Functional Channels, Paragraph 1: Clarify the type of erosion protection that will be used in the channels. Do plans include drop structures, rip/rap, concrete, tiering, or bends? Once the surface water flow evaluation is completed, please provide Broomfield with a copy of the evaluation. We also request a copy of the erosion evaluation for the channels and design maps to ensure channel grades are acceptable and areas of potential erosion have been adequately addressed.	9	The detailed design of the functional channels is not within the scope of the EA; however, each functional channel will use engineering controls to reduce erosion.

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
97.	Page 23, §3.1.4.4, Building Specific Grading Plans, Paragraph 1: The document states *Buildings 371/374, 776/777, 881, and 991 have specific grading plans as included in the IA Land Configuration Concept Design Grading Plan (Revision 1, March 2004) (K-H, 2004a). Discussions with CDPHE and DOE continue on these grading plans and could be slightly modified as a result of these discussions and limited groundwater/geotechnical/erosion evaluation at each of these building areas*. Revise the document to identify the specific document that will capture the final decision and justification for the final grading.	9	A presentation of the grading plan at each of these major buildings should be included with the building specific Decommissioning Operations Plans and have included an evaluation of groundwater and surface water interactions as well as geotechnical considerations.
98.	Page 32, §4.1.2, Wetlands: Broomfield appreciates the detailed analysis of the wetland impact assessment. We understand unquantified uncertainties lie with the projections. We agree natural vegetation and habitat should be allowed to revert to the baseline conditions rather than taking extraordinary measures to supplement artificial ecological conditions. Tables 4-1 and 4-2 were very useful and provide a quick insight of the post-closure conditions.	25	Comment Noted.
99.	Page 46, §4.2.1.2, Water Quality SW093 (North Walnut Creek): Broomfield understands the projected water flow through SW093 will be reduced therefore reducing the potential for contaminant migration. SW093 has had some issues with elevated Pu-239/240, cadmium, and silver. Broomfield is concerned the sources of the elevated levels have never been identified. We are disappointed that more aggressive measures have not been taken to determine the source of the contaminants. The potential for future results to be above the RFCA limits may continue post-closure. Once again, the document did not address the long-term stewardship obligations for monitoring at this location or identify contingencies in the event RFCA action levels are exceeded post-closure.	20	Contaminant monitoring is within the purview of RFCA and is outside the scope of the EA. Monitoring requirements are described in the Integrated Monitoring Plan, and post-closure monitoring requirements are anticipated to be addressed in a Closure Integrated Monitoring Plan.
100.	Page 48, §4.2.1.2, Water Quality GS10 (South Walnut Creek): There are still elevated levels of Pu-239/240 and silver detected periodically at GS10. The elevated levels can in most, but not all, cases be attributed to periods/seasons of high run-off and transport of solids. Broomfield is concerned the source material has not been identified that contributes to the elevated levels. Revise the document to include the long-term stewardship S&M activities associated with GS10 and the other POEs.	18	Contaminant monitoring is within the purview of RFCA and is outside the scope of the EA. Monitoring requirements are described in the Integrated Monitoring Plan, and post-closure monitoring requirements are anticipated to be addressed in a Closure Integrated Monitoring Plan.

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
101.	Page 49, §4.2.2, Air Quality: The environmental impact assessment for air quality addressed the National Ambient Air Quality Standards and the National Emission Standards for Emissions of Radionuclides Other than Radon From Department of Energy Facilities. Is beryllium assessed in the analysis?	23	As noted in the EA, RFCA remedial activities in the area are assumed to have been completed prior to pond configuration activities. Thus, the soils in the area are not expected to contain contaminants in excess of RFCA allowed levels.
102.	Page 51, §4.3, Human Health, Paragraph 1: The analysis did not include the potential to encounter contamination during the proposed actions. Revise the document to include other health issues associated with contamination in these areas.	22	As noted in the EA, RFCA remedial activities in the area are assumed to have been completed prior to pond configuration activities. Thus, the soils in the area are not expected to contain contaminants in excess of RFCA allowed levels.
103.	Page 54, §5.1.1, Pond A-1 (modified interior pond), Paragraph 1: Explain why A-1 currently has to keep its sediments wet. Broomfield assumes the pond is wetted to prevent actinides from going airborne.	22	Contaminants are present in the sediments within Pond A-1, and the pond is wetted to prevent contaminants from becoming airborne. The sediment remediation is outside the scope of the EA. Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Scope of Analysis in Environmental Assessment.
104.	Page 56, §5.1.1.2, Wildlife: The document provides a detailed analysis of ecological impacts for habitat and wildlife. What timeframe was used to complete the proposed project to determine the impacts? If the reconfiguration is performed during the hibernation period for the PMJM, when does DOE anticipate the project to start?	4	A conservative scenario was used to evaluate the impacts. Project initiation was assumed to begin during the summer when the largest amount of wildlife would be expected to be present and active. No specific timeframe for project activity completion was evaluated. Ecological impacts were evaluated assuming activities would be conducted when wildlife would be most active.
105.	Page 58, §5.1.2.1, Water Resources, Paragraph 1: With the change in configuration the baseline levels may change. Provide the City & County of Broomfield with the detailed evaluation of predicted evaporative losses. Broomfield is interested in the water rights implications. Clarify what is meant by *the potential need for an augmentation plan* associated with water rights.	22	To clarify, the evaluation of predicted evaporative losses should include an assessment of the water rights implications due to the evaporative losses and the potential need for an augmentation plan to address the evaporative losses.
106.	Page 72, Table 5-1: Based on Table 5-1, Summary Comparison of Environmental Impact – A and B Series Ponds, it is apparent the No Action Alternative should be the preferred alternative.	25	Comment Noted.

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
107.	Page 74, §6.1.1, Biological Resources, Paragraph 2: Please add "anthropogenic" to the Glossary.	25	The following definition of Anthropogenic will be added to the glossary: "relating to people or human activity".
108.	Page 75, §6.1.2.1: Broomfield understands the proposed activities and impacted areas will be revegetated per the IA Revegetation Plan. Revise the document to include the short-term S&M to ensure the success of the vegetation. Also include the long-term S&M of the vegetation to ensure protection of the ecological systems and surface water quality.	4, 21	Comment noted, but this level of detail is beyond the scope of the EA. Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Detailed Infrastructure and Operations.
June 2, 2004 A. Fenerty Email			
1.	[The document] is poorly organized, with many repetitions and even more omissions: there are no topographic maps to show the contours to help understand the relationships of the ponds to the surrounding buildings and the various connections between the two series of ponds. * The acronyms are at the end of the document, rather than at the beginning. *Diagrams are poorly constructed, such as for instance the "notch" diagram. *There is an overemphasis on possible changes effecting the vegetation rather than on human safety.	25	Comment Noted.
2.	Why do these activities not fall under RFCA/CERCLA?	21	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Scope of Analysis in Environmental Assessment.
3.	Why are the series C ponds omitted?	1	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Non-Related Surface Water Structures.
4.	What are the costs of the various alternatives?	21, 25	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Detailed Infrastructure and Operations. Per DOE NEPA regulations, an EA is prepared to analyze the effects of Federal actions on human health and the environment. Cost estimates do not play a role in this evaluation, and their inclusion in the EA is not warranted.

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
5.	What is happening to the various underground and above ground pipes between the ponds?	24	Surface piping and piping buried less than three feet below final grade will be removed. However, some piping between the A-series and B-series ponds will remain for a period of time after site closure for the management of surface water. Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Detailed Infrastructure and Operations.
6.	What are the future water conditions, based on the SWWB study based on?	22	The SWWB is a detailed computer model, using MIKE SHE code, incorporating a complex surface and groundwater interaction. The study results are available for review in the Rocky Flats Public Reading Room.
7.	Have the sediments in the ponds been cleaned up before these changes are made?	8	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Scope of Analysis in Environmental Assessment.
8.	What is the cleanup process?	8	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Scope of Analysis in Environmental Assessment.
9.	Are the dams breached to avoid the required annual inspection and periodic maintenance? "Dams will be modified to maintain their integrity and reliability." Will there be independent evaluation of this?	10	One reason for the proposed action is reduced operational and maintenance requirements associated with the ponds. Modifications to the ponds will be overseen by the State of Colorado Engineer's Office.
10.	What is the present radioactive contaminant level in the ponds? What about other COCs?	17, 19	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Scope of Analysis in Environmental Assessment and Waste Characterization and Disposal.
11.	Why is the Present Landfill pond not included? Since it is presently pumped into the A-2 pond it is part of this system.	22	Current operations involve the transfer of waters from the Present Landfill Pond to the A-series ponds. However, this practice is being discontinued, and waters from this pond will no longer enter the North Walnut Creek drainage. Analyses of this and other RFCA actions associated with the Present Landfill are contained in the IM/IRA for the Present Landfill.
12.	How will the drainage be changed around Buildings 371/374? Do we really want natural drainage around the contaminated basements and groundwater plume?	9	The grading around B371/374 is shown on the conceptual grading plan as referenced in the draft EA (Figure 3-1).

Comment Number	Comment	Response Category	Response
13.	The EA states that the purpose of these changes is stability and erosion control. Yet "location and channels needed (around 371) is still under consideration". Is this not the most important consideration? Should it not have been decided on?	9	The area west of B371/374 is being used as an on-site borrow area for clean soils to fill major building basements. There are no groundwater concerns in this area. In addition, the design of this functional channel will include the predicted channel flow velocities and erosion controls.
14.	There needs to be a scientific, peer reviewed evaluation of the flora and fauna at the site. The Hakonson review of 12/15/02, performed at the CAB's request, questions the assumption made by RFETS that prairie dogs rather than pocket gophers are the important species for burrowing mammals at the site. Yet this species is not even mentioned in the EA.	4, 25	Comment Noted.
15.	Suggest an independent, scientific survey of the baseline flora and fauna rather than the public relations "Bioblitz", planned for June 25 and 26.	4, 25	Comment Noted.
July 12, 2004 RFCLOG Letter			
1.	We would like to formally reiterate our position on a holistic approach to Site activities. Specially, the Coalition is concerned that the EA, although mentioning the twelve Site ponds, only addresses environmental impacts to the nine ponds in the A and B series due to pond reconfiguration activities. If the Site plans on addressing the environmental impacts to the additional three ponds (C series ponds and present landfill pond) in the future documentation, the future documents(s) should be referenced in the EA. If future documentation does not address environmental impacts to the additional three ponds due to pond reconfiguration, then the impacts to the three ponds must be included in this EA. Without holistically examining the twelve ponds, it will be difficult to determine if the environmental impacts to the surrounding pond areas due to reconfiguration activities have been adequately characterized.	1, 21	Please refer to Responses to Groups of Similar Comments – Exclusion of Non-Related Surface Water Structures.

Responses to Groups of Similar Comments

All received comments were reviewed and categorized into 25 categories based on similar comments.

Category of questions

1. Woman Creek – holistic approach to water
2. Water depletion
3. EA Implementation - construction
4. Wildlife/Ecology
5. Ponds – remedy or insurance
6. Culverts – filling and or plugging
7. POE vs. POC; water discharges
8. Pond sediments – contamination, removal
9. CERCLA – land configuration, erosion
10. Dams – removal, notching, reclassification
11. Hydrology
12. Treatment Units-IHSSs – contamination
13. Wetlands
14. Floodplains
15. Timing
16. Segmentation; bifurcation; piecemeal approach
17. Contaminated soils – stockpiling, placement strategy, waste management
18. GS-10
19. Sampling methodologies
20. Long term stewardship/maintenance
21. Out of scope of EA
22. Case by Case response required
23. Air quality
24. Infrastructure, logistics
25. Comment Noted - No response required

The following are the responses to groups of similar comments.

Exclusion of Non-Related Surface Water Structures (1)

Several comments were received relating to the exclusion of additional surface water structures present at RFETS. The pond configuration actions analyzed in the EA are limited in scope to the A-Series and B-Series ponds only (North and South Walnut Creek Drainages). Safety upgrades to the C-1 dam will be implemented in 2004 and are covered by a NEPA Categorical Exclusion. An analysis of the C-2 outlet works will be completed to determine if upgrades to that structure are necessary. If this action is necessary, it will be subject to the appropriate level of NEPA analysis. The South Interceptor Ditch may undergo modification to be described in the Original Landfill IM/IRA, and the Present Landfill Pond will not be modified from its current configuration. Thus, the Site's surface water system is being analyzed holistically, but only surface water structures in North and South Walnut Creek that are proposed to be modified outside of RFCA are included in the EA. §1.2 of the EA has been modified to address the exclusion of non-related surface water structures from the EA.

Scope of Analysis in Environmental Assessment (2, 8)

Several comments were received relating to the scope of activities covered by the EA. This EA only covers actions that are not regulated by RFCA. RFCA is a CERCLA and RCRA agreement/order. As outlined in DOE guidance, there is a statutory conflict between CERCLA and NEPA, and NEPA, as a matter of law, does not apply to CERCLA cleanups. DOE has adopted a policy to rely on the CERCLA process for review of actions to be taken under CERCLA, and no separate NEPA document or NEPA process is ordinarily required. DOE will address NEPA values to the extent practicable and include a brief discussion of impacts in CERCLA documents or other site environmental documents as appropriate. As such, the following lists specific RFCA actions that were identified in the received comments and the anticipated documents that will contain the environmental consequences analysis of those actions:

- Pond Sediment Remediation – Environmental Restoration RSOP Notification
- Reduced Flows Resulting from Building 995 (Wastewater Treatment Plant) Demolition – Facility Disposition RSOP Notification

Reduced flow issues were addressed qualitatively to establish a prospective wetland/vegetation baseline in order to effectively evaluate the proposed actions in the EA. A detailed analysis of the reduced flow issues will be included during the evaluation for closure of the Wastewater Treatment Plant under a RFCA decision document. §1.2 of the EA has been modified to emphasize the analysis of RFCA actions outside of the proposed actions in the EA.

Lowering of the A-2 Dam by 6 Feet (10)

Several comments were received relating to the lowering of the A-2 dam by 6 feet. There are two main reasons for lowering dam A-2 by 6 feet. First, lowering the dam to less than ten feet achieves the objective of having the dam be reclassified to a non-jurisdictional dam. Second, the drainage system is intended to allow flow-through, using a system of stop-logs (or similar height adjustment). While all of the other interior ponds will have relatively shallow pools (with a maximum of 3 feet in height), the pool depth of A-2 would be quite deep if left unaltered. If left at its existing pool height, Pond A-2 outflow would have a large drop over the notch, with resulting additional requirements for erosion protection (e.g.,

additional rock armoring at the toe of the dam and below). Therefore, to reduce the amount of armoring required (with its resulting impact on habitat), and to enhance dam safety (as noted in the EA draft text), the A-2 pool would be lowered to reduce the drop after the notch. Resulting impacts to wetlands and vegetation are described in §5.1.1.1 of the EA.

Timing of Release of Environmental Assessment (15)

Several comments were received relating to the timing of the issuance of the EA. The EA assumes that RFCA remedial actions have been completed prior to the onset of pond and land reconfiguration activities contained within the EA. EAs can take several months to prepare and finalize, and consistent with the accelerated closure of RFETS, the EA was issued in advance of the completion of RFCA remedial actions so that the EA pond and land configuration actions may immediately follow the RFCA remedial actions. If RFCA remedial actions result in a scenario where the described "baseline" in the EA is not valid, then the EA will require revision and possibly issuance for a subsequent public review if conclusions in the document are changed significantly.

Waste Characterization and Disposal (17, 19)

Several comments were received relating to the characterization and disposal of soils, sediments, and other wastes disturbed as a result of the analyzed actions. The Site currently implements a waste characterization program for all wastes generated at the Site. Waste determinations for soils/sediments/asphalt disturbed by pond and land configuration activities will be made, and decisions to either relocate, recycle, or dispose of the soils/sediments/asphalt will be made based on those determinations. The reader is reminded that RFCA remedial actions are assumed to have been completed (and resulting wastes managed) prior to the onset of the actions proposed in the EA. As part of those actions, soils and other wastes that are either determined to be hazardous or radioactively contaminated in excess of levels allowed under RFCA will not be used as fill material or left in place.

Exclusion of Detailed Infrastructure and Operations (24)

Several comments were received relating to the exclusion of detailed descriptions of infrastructure and operations of the project alternatives. As outlined in 40 CFR 1508.9, *Environmental Assessment*, an EA is meant to be a concise public document to briefly provide sufficient evidence and analysis for determining whether to prepare an EIS or a FONSI. While infrastructure and operational details (including engineering designs of the modified dams) will be developed as part of an operations plan and implemented through the Site Integrated Work Control Process, the inclusion of such detail at the EA stage of a Federal decision is not warranted.